

# THE JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY

*Volume V*

MARCH 1933

*Number 1*

## THE DUNKIRK MONEY, 1662

**I**N THE autumn of 1662, Charles II sold Dunkirk to Louis XIV for five million livres. In order to secure all in cash, he allowed a 12 per cent discount on the later instalments which reduced the total to 4,654,000 livres. Of this amount, the odd 154,000 was paid in London, and the remainder—four and one-half million livres, all in silver—was actually transported late in November from Paris to London. It is the purpose of this article to relate the details of this unusual transfer of money, and to throw light on the sources from which it was derived and the uses to which it was put.

England had obtained Dunkirk only four years before, but it was already proving a costly possession; and Charles II, harassed with debts, arrears, petitions from his father's friends and from the seemingly infinite number of persons who appear to have helped him in escaping from Worcester, was glad to sacrifice almost anything for ready cash.

At the king's suggestion, Clarendon wrote a letter of invitation, and in August, D'Estrades came to London as Louis XIV's special envoy.<sup>1</sup> Three weeks of conferences resulted in

<sup>1</sup> The best secondary account of the negotiations is by A. de Saint-Léger, "L'acquisition de Dunkerque et de Mardyck par Louis XIV," in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, II (1900), 233-45, which is an expansion of a part of his doctoral dissertation, entitled *De Flandriae Comitatus Primordiis: La Flandre maritime et Dunkerque sous la*

reducing the sale price from twelve to five millions, and in raising the French offer from two to four millions. Then three weeks of waiting brought an agreement on five millions, including stores and ammunition which had previously been considered separately. But there was delay about the terms, for Louis XIV would offer only two million cash and Charles would be satisfied with nothing short of all cash. The *impasse* soon resolved itself into the problem of finding financiers to discount Louis' later instalments. Lombard Street was ransacked but in vain;<sup>2</sup> and the Parisian house of Simonnet refused to make the advance to Louis XIV.<sup>3</sup> Thereupon, Colbert—a new star in the French firmament—found a way out. On October 3,<sup>4</sup>

---

*domination française, 1659-1789* (Paris, 1900). The more important documents on the subject have been printed by L. Lemaire in *Bulletin de l'Union Faulconnier*, XXI (1924), 1-223. This work, entitled "Le rachat de Dunkerque par Louis XIV," and hereafter referred to as "Lemaire," contains 142 letters, dependably edited from French archives. This can be said of no other collection of D'Estrades' correspondence except his *Correspondance authentique ... de 1637 à 1660*, edited by A. de Saint-Léger and Lemaire for La Société de l'Histoire de France, of which only Volume I (to 1646) has appeared (Paris, 1924). For analyses and criticisms of the various early editions, see, in addition to the introduction to *Correspondance authentique*, I. Goll, "Recherches critiques sur l'authenticité des ambassades et négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades," in *Revue historique*, III, 283-96; IV (1877), 278-326; A. de Saint-Léger, "Les diverses éditions des lettres, mémoires, et négociations de M. le Comte d'Estrades, et la propagande anti-française dans la première moitié du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," in *Bibliographie moderne*, XXI (1922-23), 89-103; and H. C. Rogge, "De Diplomatieke Correspondentie van Godefroy d'Estrades," in *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der K. Acad. Van Wetenschappen* (1897) (*Letterkunde*, Vol. IV, Part V). Although the early editions print correctly many of the letters herein cited, it has been deemed advisable, owing to their general undependability, to refer only to Lemaire's collection.

<sup>2</sup> York to Turenne, Sept. 13-23 in Lemaire, pp. 98-99. Cf. W. D. Macray, *Notes which passed at meetings of the Privy Council* (London, 1896), No. 74. This note, dated Oct., 1662, contains Clarendon's reminder: "The Marchande who is to give security: ———." The editor's note supplies: "Duarte, or Diego, da Silva, a Jew," on what authority I know not. Da Silva was the one through whom the queen's dowry was paid (see W. A. Shaw, "Beginnings of the national debt," in *Owens College historical essays* [London, 1902], p. 411), and he was probably solicited in vain in this connection.

<sup>3</sup> Louis' and Colbert's letters to D'Estrades, Oct. 3 in Lemaire, pp. 104, 108. Colbert's letter is also printed in G. B. Depping, *Correspondance administrative sous le règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1850-52), III, 10-11. Charles II provided Louis with a list of London merchants whose security would be acceptable.

<sup>4</sup> All dates given singly, unless otherwise indicated, are New, or Continental, Style. D'Estrades dated his letters thus from England, not changing to the Old, or English, Style which was ten days behind the Continent.

he wrote to D'Estrades that Jean Hérincx, Parisian merchant and banker, would undertake the task and was leaving immediately for London.<sup>5</sup>

There is nothing in Louis' or Colbert's letters to D'Estrades to arouse suspicion that Jean Hérincx was different from other bankers. But an oft-quoted fragment of a memoir, attributed to Louis XIV, states that he acted not in a private capacity but as a royal agent, and that his commission was really a saving to the French treasury,<sup>6</sup> which was stated to be 500,000 livres. At the very most, Louis should have said only 346,000 livres; but he should also have deducted a reasonable interest on the 3,000,000 livres, which would have been paid quarterly over two years. At 6 per cent this deduction would be 180,000 livres, leaving a net saving to France of 166,000 livres, or one-third of Louis' boastful figure. Ten per cent was a more common interest rate for the time,<sup>7</sup> and that would reduce the saving to 46,000 livres. However it may be figured, there could have been no enormous economy to France in paying England 2,654,000 livres in November, 1662, instead of 3,000,000 livres in the course of two years. Money in hand could bear interest then as now. What Louis XIV meant, in case the statement attributed to him is authentic, is that France and not the French treasury was saved money. In other words, a total

<sup>5</sup> Lemaire, p. 108. See above, n. 3.

<sup>6</sup> "Je gagnai même sur ce marché cinq cent mille livres, sans que les Anglais s'en aperçussent. Car ne pouvant s'imaginer qu'en l'état où on avait vu mes affaires peu de temps auparavant j'eusse moyen de leur fournir promptement cette grande somme comme ils le désiraient, ils acceptèrent avec joie l'offre que leur fit un banquier de la payer en argent comptant, moyennant cette remise de cinq cette mille livres; mais le banquier était un homme interposé par moi, qui, faisant le paiement de mes propres deniers, ne profitait point de la remise" (*Mémoires de Louis XIV pour l'instruction du Dauphin*, ed. Charles Dreyss [Paris 1860], II, 560, which is taken from *Les œuvres de Louis XIV* [Paris, 1806], I, 176-77). See "Étude sur la composition des mémoires de Louis XIV," in the former work, I, i-ccii, and particularly pp. lxxxvi, lxxxvii, cliv. I have rejected certain other details of the transfer which are to be found only in the above references.

<sup>7</sup> Six per cent appears to have been the legal rate of interest in England at this time but an "award" of 3 or 4 per cent was frequently paid, particularly by a government in a time of necessity (Shaw, *op. cit.*, p. 415; cf. *Calendar of treasury books, 1660-67*, p. 681).

of 346,000 livres remained in France which would otherwise have gone to England.

But Louis' alleged statement is vulnerable on many points and, in the absence of other evidence, should be rejected even though accepted by most historians.<sup>8</sup> It is only to be found in a fragment of doubtful origin, which is appended to a collection of vainglorious memoirs "pour l'instruction du dauphin." Most of the memoirs went through several revisions before being put in final form by Pellisson, the royal historiographer, whose accuracy should be considered on a parity with others of his profession. Furthermore, even *he* did not include it in the part which he edited for publication.

It may be noted later that no payment of a commission to Hérinx is cited, but considering the state of French financial records of the time, no conclusion therefrom would be permissible; and if he performed this transaction free of charge, he was undoubtedly rewarded otherwise. He was later a bona fide Parisian banker, remitting money to Barillon in London,<sup>9</sup> and very likely he played the same rôle in 1662. Colbert described him to D'Estrades as one "qui est, comme je crois, connu de vous [D'Estrades] et qui a quelque créance en moy depuis longtemps moyennant les assurances que je luy ay donné est"; and Louis said he was a man "qui a à sa disposition toutes les meilleures bourses d'Amsterdam, et je veux croire aussi celles de Londres."<sup>10</sup>

Hérinx arrived in London on the evening of October 2/12, and the next morning at eight he went into conference with Albemarle and the treasurer, Southampton, whom Charles had appointed special commissioners for the purpose. He first asked for a commission of 500,000 livres, but soon agreed on 340,000,

<sup>8</sup> Lemaire, p. 24; Saint-Léger, "L'acquisition de Dunkerque et de Mardyck par Louis XIV," *loc. cit.*, pp. 241-42 n.; Pierre Clément, *Lettres, instructions, et mémoires de Colbert* (Paris, 1861-82), II, 233 n.; C. Gaillardin, *Histoire du règne de Louis XIV* (Paris, 1871-75), III, 157.

<sup>9</sup> R. H. George, "Financial relations of Louis XIV and James II," *Journal of modern history*, III (1931), 410 n.

<sup>10</sup> Above n. 3; cf. E. Bouchet, "Colbert, Louvois, et Vauban à Dunkerque," in *Mémoires de la Société Dunkerquoise*, XIX (1874-75), 258-59.

plus 6,000 for carting the huge sum of silver to Dunkirk where delivery was to be made upon surrender of the town.<sup>11</sup>

The treaty was signed on October 17/27.<sup>12</sup> Three days later Alderman Edward Backwell, London goldsmith and paymaster of the Dunkirk garrison, was instructed by Secretary Morice to go to Paris to count the money.<sup>13</sup> Later, Calais was substituted as the place of counting, and in the end, in order to hasten the transfer of the city in the face of a rising opposition, it was substituted for Dunkirk as the place of delivery. Backwell's responsibility on the Continent was to extend to the embarkation of the money on English ships in charge of Sir George Carteret, vice-chamberlain and treasurer of the navy.<sup>14</sup> With the depositing of the money in the Tower of London, he was again to assume official custody jointly with the lieutenant of the Tower.

As early as October 20, even before definite assurance of Hérix's agreement had been received, Lionne informed D' Estrades that he was starting to "barrel" the livres at the

<sup>11</sup> D'Estrades to Lionne, Oct. 12, and to Colbert, Oct. 16, and Hérix to Colbert, Oct. 16 in Lemaire, pp. 115, 120-22. For the convention, which was signed separately at the same time as the treaty, see *Calendar of state papers, domestic, 1661-62*, p. 519. Charles demanded payment all in silver because of less probable loss than in gold (Lemaire, p. 120).

<sup>12</sup> In Public Record Office, *Treaties*, 57. Printed in Jean Dumont, *Corps universel diplomatique* (Amsterdam, 1726-31), VI, Part II, 432.

<sup>13</sup> *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, II, 523. Lemaire, pp. 141-43. See also F. G. Hilton Price, "Some account of the business of Alderman Edward Backwell," in *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society*, VI (1890), 191-230; and R. D. Richards, "A pre-Bank of England English banker—Edward Backwell," in *Economic journal*, "Economic history series," No. 3 (1928), pp. 335-55; and *Dict. nat. biog.* Among the ledgers of Backwell, now in the possession of Glyn, Mills, and Company (successors, since the amalgamation of 1923, to Messrs. Child: a bank directly descended from that of Sir Francis Child [d. 1713] whose daughter was the wife of Backwell's grandson) is a rough account book, covering 1657-78, entitled *Copies of Dunkirk affair*. It contains chiefly papers relating to his work as paymaster of the garrison, on which there is considerable information in Price, *loc. cit.*, VI, 200-208. See also Macray, *Notes*, No. 34. Sir John Shaw was also a paymaster of the garrison at that time.

<sup>14</sup> *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, p. 545. His instructions of Nov. 5-15 (Lemaire, pp. 189-90) make no mention of Hérix's commission, but include it, along with the 6,000 livres for transportation, as an item of 346,000 livres, "for carriage." Elsewhere it is put down as "expenses." He was to give receipt to Hérix for 3,000,000 livres, and to Louis XIV's commissioners for 2,000,000 livres.

Louvre.<sup>15</sup> On October 31, detailed instructions were given to one Picon de la Boudre for transporting the large sum to Calais.<sup>16</sup> From these instructions we learn of the sources from which the 4,500,000 livres were gathered together. Of the original cash offer of 2,000,000 livres, which was to be loaded in twenty carts, the instructions stated that 1,600,000 livres were "furnished by the farmers of aids and customs,<sup>17</sup> conducted by M. Douilly, who is interested in the said farm and who will be responsible for having it counted and paid correctly"; and the remaining 400,000 livres would be furnished "by the farmers of the five Great Farms,<sup>18</sup> conducted by M. Apoil, who will take the same care to have it counted and paid." Messrs. Ollivier and Hérinx were furnishing another 2,000,000 in twenty carts, in charge of one Antoine Heron; and the final 500,000 was coming from the royal treasury in six carts in charge of one whose name was still a blank when the instructions were drawn up. In summary, the money was obtained as follows: the royal treasury, 500,000 livres; loan by tax farmers, 2,000,000 livres; loan by Hérinx and an associate, 2,000,000 livres. For use in case of accident or necessity, Picon was provided with a letter of exchange for 100,000 livres "upon the Calais deputy of the farmers of the Five Great Farms."

By November 3, the money was ready and Picon started. Heavy rains delayed him near Boulogne (where he arrived on the 8th), and on one occasion he had to call upon all the local

<sup>15</sup> Lemaire, p. 125.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 148-50. See Colbert's further instructions on paying the money, Nov. 3, in *ibid.*, pp. 150-53.

<sup>17</sup> These constituted one of the three main divisions of the indirect revenues, chiefly excise on wines and liquors (Alfred Neymarck, *Colbert et son temps* [Paris, 1877], I, 101).

<sup>18</sup> A compact zone in Northern France, including Paris, Normandy, Maine, Anjou, Poitou, Picardy, Champagne, etc. Until leased to one company for tax farming in 1661, it had been assigned to five; and it long continued to be called "l'étendue de cinq grosses fermes." See Neymarck, *op. cit.*, I, 99-101; and M. Marion, *Histoire financière de la France depuis 1715* (Paris, 1914), I, 28. Jean Loret (in *La muze historique* [Paris, 1857-78], III, 567) lauds these tax farmers for this generous advance and perpetuates the names of several (Bonneau, Girardin, Malet, La Font, Dalibert, Cazet, de Gomont, and Bauchin) as "dignes d'avoir une part dans l'Histoire." Colbert (in his "Mémoire sur les finances" in Clément, *op. cit.*, II, 17-68) states that they were willing to loan 1,600,000 livres more than the 2,000,000 asked for (pp. 63-64).

horsepower to extricate his carts from the deep Flemish mud which British soldiers of 1914-18 know so well. But on Saturday evening, November 11, a date those same soldiers know, he and his forty-six carts were at Calais, and the money was safely stored in magazines.<sup>19</sup> Hérinx, Backwell, and three assistants were already there, awaiting their laborious task of counting 1,500,000 silver *écus*.

Hérinx had warned Colbert that it would take a good while to count the money.<sup>20</sup> Backwell was a meticulous person, he said, and his detailed instructions on avoiding fraud and error made him no less so. He would want to "test every *écu* thinking that most of those from France were counterfeit." It is interesting to note that Hérinx leaves the impression that there was considerable justification for Backwell's suspicions, and he probably wrote to Colbert in the hope that extra care would be taken against error and counterfeit money so as not to delay the counting. D'Estrades had similar anxiety over the possible time required for turning over the money.<sup>21</sup> There was genuine need for haste because opposition to the sale was developing on all sides. Not until the very date for the signing of the treaty was the entire privy council informed of what was going on; and it was anything but satisfied. The influential Albemarle was in the negotiations almost from the start, and constantly opposed, though probably in his weak post-Restoration way.<sup>22</sup> Sandwich and Southampton, who with Albemarle were empowered to conduct the negotiations,<sup>23</sup> also questioned the advisability of the sale—at least at that price. Secretary Morice, Albemarle's kinsman and creature, was instrumental in postponing the final

<sup>19</sup> Picon de la Boudre to Colbert, Nov. 11, Lemaire, pp. 175-76.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 166-67.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 170-71.

<sup>22</sup> This is seldom understood. Sir Charles Firth (*Cambridge modern history* [Cambridge, 1908], V, 106) and most others (e.g., R. Lodge, *Political history of England, 1660-1702* [London, 1910], p. 22) accept Clarendon's statements that Albemarle was converted over to it. D'Estrades, on the other hand, states repeatedly (letter to Louis XIV, Sept. 25, in Lemaire, pp. 99-100; to Lionne Oct. 26, p. 126; and cf. pp. 38-39) that he and Morice were opposed throughout, and did all they could to delay the negotiations.

<sup>23</sup> Powers of Sept. 1/11, Lemaire, p. 87.

signature for several days, much to D'Estrades and Louis XIV's anxiety. Furthermore, just two days before the signing of the treaty, the pro-Spanish Henry Bennett, later Earl of Arlington, became secretary of state; and he and his cabal began immediately to utilize the sale against the chancellor.<sup>24</sup> The merchants of the City opposed the transaction vigorously, fearing the resumption of Dunkirk's previous piracies from which they had been temporarily freed.<sup>25</sup> It seems clear that Clarendon really stood alone with the king and York in favor of going on with the sale. There is no reason to doubt D'Estrades' confidential statements to Louis and Colbert on this point, and they are clear. And he, if anyone, should know the truth. On September 21, he wrote to Louis: "Cette affaire étoit d'une nature très délicate pour le Roi d'Angleterre, et pour lui principalement, par l'apparence qu'il y avoit, qu'elle ne servit pas approuvée des principaux du Royaume, ni même du Parlement."<sup>26</sup> And on October 27, he set forth Clarendon's rôle in these terms: "Le chancelier est celui de tous qui a en le plus à souffrir pendant les contestations, qui ont été formées par tout le conseil sur cette affaire. Les commissaires [Albemarle, Sandwich, and Southampton] sont ceux qui ont le plus travaille à le rompre et l'on peut dire le Roi d'Angleterre et M. le Duc d'York en auroient été ebranlez s'il n'avoit pris soin de les maintenir dans des premières résolutions."<sup>27</sup> There is no mistaking D'Estrades' idea as to who in England was responsible for the sale.

In addition to this many-sided opposition at home, there were mutinous mutterings in the unpaid regiments at Dunkirk.<sup>28</sup> If

<sup>24</sup> D'Estrades to Louis XIV, Oct. 19, in *ibid.*, p. 124; Violet Barbour, *Henry Bennett, Earl of Arlington* (Washington, 1914), pp. 46-69.

<sup>25</sup> D'Estrades to Louis XIV, Oct. 27, and to Lionne, Oct. 31, in Lemaire, pp. 126-34, 146; cf. pp. 38-39; *Historical Manuscripts Commission, eleventh report* (London, 1887), Appendix V, p. 10.

<sup>26</sup> Lemaire, pp. 95-96.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 126-34. Clarendon, himself, of course, tells a very different story (*Life* [Oxford, 1827], II, 243 ff.).

<sup>28</sup> D'Estrades to Louis, Oct. 27, in Lemaire, pp. 126-34; and cf. p. 30. See also *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, p. 438. Lord Rutherford, governor of Dunkirk, was in London at that time.



the place was to be sold, it would have to be done quickly. Several things therefore happened in quick succession. Two Dunkirk regiments were ordered home at once. Instructions were sent that the money should be embarked at Calais rather than Dunkirk, and that, if it seemed advisable, the town should actually be turned over before the money was embarked.<sup>29</sup> Lastly, D'Estrades hastened to Calais the moment the treaty was ratified (November 1/11) in order to expedite the counting of the money.<sup>30</sup>

Picon de la Boudre had also done his bit toward the same end. During the first night after his arrival, he verified in some hasty manner 1,000,000 livres in the hope of persuading Backwell that all was correct.<sup>31</sup> But the cautious goldsmith retained all his caution during the first day of the counting, Monday, November 13, when only 150,000 livres—i.e., 50,000 *écus* or crowns, the current silver coin—were counted. They found only ten questionable pieces which probably increased Backwell's faith a little. Thereafter, he agreed to examine only ten coins from each bag.<sup>32</sup> But even that meant a task of several weeks, during which the forces of opposition would be mobilizing daily. D'Estrades proposed that Backwell (and later Carteret) take conditional possession of the money and count it in London if Hérinx would promise to make good any error or counterfeit coins.<sup>33</sup> But Hérinx would not agree, fearing that such leisurely counting would result in considerable loss to himself. This incident constitutes further argument against the truth of Louis'

<sup>29</sup> D'Estrades to Colbert, Nov. 16, in Lemaire, pp. 184-85. Colbert in writing to the intendant of Languedoc on Nov. 24 referred to this last concession of Charles II as "une circonstance bien particulière ... qui marque assez la déférence que les princes estrangers ont pour la personne du roy" (Depping, *op. cit.*, I, 88).

<sup>30</sup> Letters to Louis XIV, Nov. 6 and 11, in Lemaire, pp. 155-60, 170-71.

<sup>31</sup> It may be that 100,000 livres was meant, which amount could actually have been counted. Picon de la Boudre to Colbert, Nov. 11, in Lemaire, pp. 175-76.

<sup>32</sup> Picon de la Boudre to Colbert, Nov. 13, in Lemaire, p. 179. It is probable that Hérinx showed a little exasperation at times. On Nov. 26, Colbert wrote to him: "Il est de grande importance qu'au lieu de leur tesmoigner du chagrin de toutes leur chicanes et de ce qu'ils prétendent examiner tous les écus blancs, les uns après les autres, vous les invitiez vous-même à vérifier toutes les espèces" (Clément, *op. cit.*, II, 233 n.).

<sup>33</sup> D'Estrades to Lionne (or Colbert?), Nov. 14, in Lemaire, pp. 179-80.

statement that Hérinx was merely a treasury agent. But even though that proposal failed, D'Estrades' presence or something did speed up the business materially. On Tuesday, 250,000 livres were counted; on Wednesday, 350,000; and by Saturday, they were handling 400,000 a day. This, they declared, was a maximum. They worked from eight to four and had their meals brought to them at the magazine. By Saturday night their fingers were raw and bloody and they appreciated the Sunday on which the English would not work.<sup>34</sup> Apparently, it would not have mattered to the French. D'Estrades, meanwhile, returned to England, pleased with the somewhat accelerated progress being made, and on Monday morning, November 20, Backwell's clerks started in on the final 2,500,000 livres, hoping to complete it by Saturday night.

On the 22d, Carteret arrived with four yachts and a frigate to bear the money to England. Immediately thereafter came a foretaste of what was to happen soon to all the money. One hundred thousand livres had to be loaded on two carts and sent to Dunkirk in charge of one Mopertin and thirty musketeers. On November 18, Rutherford and D'Estrades had conferred at Mardyke on the details of surrendering the city, and the former had revealed that he would need that amount to pay debts and arrears before he could leave. He had been expecting it, so he said, in ships from Zealand, which did not arrive. In order to avoid possible delay and trouble, at the last moment, he wrote to Backwell asking that the amount be advanced from the purchase money. Carteret upon his arrival probably assumed responsibility for this sudden requisition and it was permitted, the money arriving safely at Dunkirk on Saturday, the 25th.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Hérinx to Colbert, Nov. 15 and 18, in *ibid.*, pp. 183-84, 191-92. Also Picon de la Boudre to Colbert, Nov. 18, in *ibid.*, pp. 193-94 ("je presse la verification de l'argent, sans donner aucune méfiance à M. Backwell, qui continue toujours de mesme qu'il a commancé, encor qu'il ne trouve du mescomte ny de faux, pour l'obliger à cette sévérité").

<sup>35</sup> D'Estrades' letters of Nov. 11, 21, and 25 in *ibid.*, pp. 195-99, 200-201, 207; and Picon de la Boudre's letters of Nov. 22 and 23, pp. 203-205. Cf. Rutherford to Bennet, Nov. 11/21 in *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, p. 553. The warrant of Dec. 6/16 (*Cal. treas.*

On the same day, the final kegs of money were counted, exactly two weeks after their arrival, and their contents were transferred to about 293 English chests and sealed. Two days later, they were placed on shipboard.<sup>36</sup> Following the delivery of Dunkirk on the 28th, the fleet sailed and the money was soon piled high in the Tower of London whither Charles II came to feast his eyes upon its glorious bulk.<sup>37</sup> Pepys was there, too, and thought "it was but poor discourse and frothy that the king's companions, young Killigrew among the rest, had with him" on so great an occasion.<sup>38</sup> For the moment, it perhaps mattered little to the light-hearted king that much of the money had already been spent. He had promised during the course of the negotiations that it "should not be touched but upon extraordinary occasions."<sup>39</sup> But within a few weeks, two-thirds of it had been allocated to army and navy arrears, and expenses of the royal household. The other third (£100,000) was ordered to the mint to be melted down and coined into English money;<sup>40</sup> but before it arrived, at least £11,300 of it was also swallowed up by the ravenous navy;<sup>41</sup> and immediately after being coined, £13,000 more had to go to Backwell for newly contracted debts over and above the debts for which he, by that time, held the remainder of the French *écus* as security.<sup>42</sup>

---

*books, 1660-67, p. 458*) for £8,876 "for the pay of the king's own regiment of Guards at Dunkirk to Nov. 17 last" undoubtedly refers to this incident. The chests contained 5,000 *écus* each. There would, therefore, have been 300 but for the 100,000 livres sent to Dunkirk.

<sup>36</sup> Sir George Carteret to Charles II, Nov. 18/28, *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, p. 561. On Oct. 15, 1664, Backwell was granted £1,500 for his work in connection with the sale, with special reference to "ye hazard in securing it against all false counting" (Richards, *op. cit.*, p. 344 n.; cf. *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1664-65*, p. 24). But it appears that he never actually received it until Sept., 1667 (Price, *op. cit.*, p. 210).

<sup>37</sup> Battailler to Louis, Dec. 4 in Lemaire, pp. 215-16. The final 154,000 livres arranged for in London (above, p. 1) was paid to Stephen Fox on Dec. 7/17 by Abraham Dolins "in the name of Hérinx of Paris" (*Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, pp. 519, 563, 588; *Addenda, 1660-70*, p. 674). See below n. 46.

<sup>38</sup> Samuel Pepys, *Diary*, Nov. 21 and 24, 1662.

<sup>39</sup> Burnet, *History of his own time* (Oxford, 1897), I, 304; Clarendon, *Life*, II, 251.

<sup>40</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67*, pp. 459, 460, 526.

<sup>41</sup> Below, note d, under Table I.

<sup>42</sup> Below, p. 13.

What happened to this large sum of money is described by Dr. William A. Shaw, editor of the *Calendars of treasury books*, as "by far the most curious of all [the] transactions with the bankers."<sup>43</sup> The ordinary procedure would, of course, have been to melt down and recoin the entire 1,500,000 *écus*, but such an order was far beyond the immediate capacity of the decrepit mint; and the need was immediate. The government therefore turned over chests of *écus* to bankers as security for loans, and also to department heads and individual creditors for them to use as security for loans wherever they could best secure them. The army, navy, and various individuals could not spend the *écus* in England, but they could borrow upon them. Thus whether directly, or indirectly via the army paymaster, navy treasurer, navy victualler, or cofferer of the royal household, two-thirds of the chests of *écus* were soon again in bankers' vaults, mostly Backwell's, as security for loans. Backwell was still, along with the lieutenant of the Tower, a joint guardian of the money, and these loans on his part, therefore, represent a curious transfer of Dunkirk chests from his official to his private custody.

In this manner, the government immediately borrowed of the three chief bankers, Backwell, Francis Meynell, and Robert Vyner, £30,000 for the navy, and £36,000 for the royal household.<sup>44</sup> By January 22 (O.S.), 166 $\frac{2}{3}$  department heads and others had been authorized to borrow £114,202, and by July 16, 1663, the total of these borrowings, direct and indirect, was £223,603 17s. 8d., distributed according to Table I.<sup>45</sup>

It appears that by July, 1663, Backwell either held all the security for loans on Dunkirk money or else acted as the agent for a consortium of bankers in their relation to the government regarding these loans. At any rate, he was then in possession of,

<sup>43</sup> See his article, cited in n. 2, p. 412, *passim*.

<sup>44</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67*, p. 459. The £36,000 is referred to as having been "formerly lent," and should perhaps be regarded as payment in *écus* of a previously contracted debt to the bankers.

<sup>45</sup> Arranged largely from the summary statements in *ibid.*, p. 493 (Jan. 22, 1662/3), and p. 535 (July 16, 1663), but also from the separate items referred to in the footnotes to Table I.

**TABLE I**  
**DISBURSEMENTS OF DUNKIRK MONEY TO JULY, 1663**  
 (All Dates Are Old Style)

	AMOUNT		PAID TO	FOR
	Authorized by January 22, 1662/3	Authorized Further by July 16, 1663		
ARMY	£ 83,702 1s. 4d.	£1,452 2s. 6d.	Stephen Fox, Paymaster of the Guards	Soldiers' pay distributed as follows: Guards, balance to Oct. 4, 1662 £ 9,454 5s. 8d. <sup>a</sup> Guards, Oct. 4 to Nov. 29, 1662 18,831 19s. 4d. <sup>b</sup> Lord Wentworth's regiment, Nov. 17, 1662—Jan. 17, 1662/3 3,702 1s. 4d. <sup>c</sup> Portsmouth garrison Aug. 9—Nov. 29, 1662 3,165 17s. 4d. <sup>d</sup>
	20,000		Sir John Shaw and Alderman Backwell, Paymasters	Arrears of the Dunkirk garrison Sept. 25, 1660—July 29, 1661 <sup>e</sup>
	14,000	3,349 13s. 10d.	Thomas Povie, Agent for Tangier	Tangier garrison <sup>f</sup>
NAVY	30,000	40,000	Sir George Carteret, Treasurer of the Navy	The navy <sup>g</sup>
	10,000		Dennis Gauden, Victualler of the Navy	Victualling of the navy <sup>h</sup>
ROYAL HOUSEHOLD, etc. <sup>i</sup>	20,000 <sup>j</sup>	36,000 <sup>k</sup>	William Ashburnham, Cofferer of the Household	
	5,000 <sup>l</sup>		Earl of Sandwich, Master of the Great Wardrobe	
	5,000 <sup>m</sup>		Sir Edward Griffin, Treasurer of the Chamber	
	1,000 <sup>n</sup>		Sir Charles Berkeley, Keeper of the Privy Purse	
MINT:	1,000	600	Henry Slingsby, Master of the Mint	Repairs and equipment for the mint <sup>o</sup>
MISCELLANEOUS:	1,000		George Kirke, Keeper of Whitehall, etc.	Arrears of pension <sup>p</sup>
		1,500	Earl of Bath, Groom of the Stole	Probably pension
TOTAL	£142,202 1s. 4d.	£81,401 16s. 4d.		
	£223,603 17s. 8d.			

<sup>a</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, p. 512.*

<sup>b</sup> *Ibid., p. 506.*

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid., p. 512.*

<sup>d</sup> *Ibid.* There is a discrepancy of 2d. between the total of these four items and the two amounts given at the left. One should add to these military items passing through Fox's hands £11,300 received from Dolins (above, n. 37), which he was authorized to keep without turning it into the exchequer, and which never entered into the summaries relating to the "Dunkirk Money" (*ibid.*, p. 515; *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1663-64, p. 112*).

<sup>e</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, p. 464; Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62, p. 587.*

<sup>f</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, p. 493.*

<sup>g</sup> The first amount was borrowed directly by the government (above, and n. 44); the second was borrowed by Carteret in two equal instalments, both in December (*Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, pp. 457, 462*).

<sup>h</sup> *Ibid., p. 464.*

<sup>i</sup> The January authorization also included £3,500 "to the use of the Queen," which, being omitted from the July summary, was probably not paid.

<sup>j</sup> *Ibid., p. 492.*

<sup>k</sup> The amount borrowed directly by the government (above, p. 12).

<sup>l</sup> *Ibid., p. 492.*

<sup>m</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, p. 464.*

<sup>n</sup> *Ibid., pp. 464, 538.*

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid., p. 491.*

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid., pp. 456-57, 459, 460, 658, Cal. st. ps., dom., 1663-64, p. 15.* Among the many mint papers in the Graham MSS (*Hist. MSS Comm., sixth rept.* [London, 1877], pp. 332-33) are some referring to these operations.

<sup>q</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67, pp. 461, 518.*

or at least control of, two hundred chests (about two-thirds of the total number), which were estimated to be worth £210,526. But this was £13,077 17s. 8d. short of the above total borrowings. The mint was therefore ordered to pay Backwell the total £223,603 17s. 8d. as rapidly as recoinng could be accomplished. For every £20,000 delivered to Backwell he was to surrender 19 chests of *écus* "till 200 chests of His Majesty's silver lately deposited upon loan should be returned by him into the mint to be coined into sterling."<sup>46</sup> The mint was to pay the unsecured balance of £13,077 17s. 8d. by drawing upon "the king's moneys now in [its] custody," i.e., the £100,000, or less, originally sent there to be coined.

Thenceforth the mint melted and coined *écus* into English money which it gave to Backwell for more *écus* until the latter were all redeemed. Meanwhile, ordinary income from revenue, on the security of which Dunkirk money had been advanced to certain departments, came in and made possible the redeeming of some of the recoined Dunkirk money from Backwell's hands. This, together with the £75,000 odd left of the £100,000 originally ordered to the mint after two deductions,<sup>47</sup> was paid out at various times during the next two years to the army and navy. From July, 1663, to July, 1665, traceable payments to the former total £64,236 2s. 2d.<sup>48</sup> and to the latter £40,000.<sup>49</sup> It is probable that by 1668 the entire amount had been recoined,<sup>50</sup> but Backwell still held some and probably much of it.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 535. This is at the rate of 14.25 livres to the pound sterling. But Dolins paid Fox (see nn. 37, and d under Table I) only £11,300 for 154,000 livres, or at the rate of 13.63. Approximately this rate still obtained in the reign of James II (George, *loc. cit.*, III, 400 n.).

As regards Backwell's relation to the other bankers at the time, it may be noted that in 1672, "all the goldsmiths kept accounts with Backwell for clearing purposes" (F. G. H. Price, *Handbook of London bankers* [London, 1890], p. 4).

<sup>47</sup> Amounts of £11,300 and £13,077 17s. 8d. (above, pp. 10, 13).

<sup>48</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67*, pp. 588, 622, 630, 658; *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1664-65*, pp. 41, 118, 193, 476. These payments were all to Stephen Fox, and mostly for secret or undesignated, but presumably military, purposes.

<sup>49</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1660-67*, pp. 599, 622, 627, 656; *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1663-64*, p. 590; *1664-65*, p. 96.

<sup>50</sup> This is based upon audits of Dunkirk accounts presented by both Backwell and Slingsby in June, 1668 (*Cal. treas. books, 1667-68*, p. 363). They were probably final on

In May of that year, he was asked to loan £600 of the Dunkirk money for transporting English soldiers home from Portugal,<sup>51</sup> and in June, Sir Robert Long was asked to reserve "£3,000 of the Dunkirk money to be shortly paid in by Alderman Backwell and Sir John Shaw to pay my Lords their midsummer quarters salaries."<sup>52</sup>

Dr. Shaw has not allowed Restoration scholars of the last generation to forget for a moment that Charles II was honest, and scrupulous, and that he did the best he could on his slender resources.<sup>53</sup> Parliament, as he sees it, was the villain of the piece. While one must take exception to these generalizations, they contain too much truth to be disregarded. I have possibly ridiculed somewhat Charles's promise to keep the Dunkirk money separate and inviolate for "extraordinary occasions." But it must be admitted that the financial situation in December, 1662, made that practically impossible. The news of the arrival of the money was the signal for a flood of petitions for the payment of debts and claims. For example, Mary Simpson petitioned for £15,595 due her father and uncle for royal jewels, "without which her father, mother, and their ten children must perish."<sup>54</sup> There is no record of payment and the same fate appears to have attended nearly all such petitions; for most of the money was used for legitimate purposes connected with the army, navy, and royal household, not for royal mistresses, nor for Clarendon's new palace so quickly dubbed "Dunkirk House" by his enemies.<sup>55</sup> There was probably some genuine

---

the part of the latter, although there is no assurance of that, since there was considerable miscellaneous auditing of accounts in connection with the change from Clarendon to the Cabal. In December, 1672, Slingsby was still melting down French silver coins (*Hist. MSS Comm., sixth rept.*, p. 332), but this was undoubtedly money received as a result of the treaty of Dover. See the writer's "Louis XIV's financial relations with Charles II and the English parliament," in *Jour. mod. hist.*, I (1929), 181.

<sup>51</sup> *Cal. treas. books, 1667-68*, p. 334.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 366. When the "Stop of the Exchequer" occurred in 1672, Charles II owed Backwell £295,994 16s. 6d. (Price, *Handbook of London bankers*, p. 4).

<sup>53</sup> See his article, cited in n. 2, and his lengthy introductions to the *Cal. treas. books*.

<sup>54</sup> *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1661-62*, p. 628.

<sup>55</sup> The total received for Dunkirk amounted to about £327,000 (n. 46), and the total of all payments from Dunkirk money which have been found and mentioned on the

attempt to keep the money separate. On October 24, 1664, £15,000 was paid to Carteret from the Dunkirk money (presumably the newly coined English money, and not *écus* redeemed from the bankers), but it was to be repaid from revenues assigned to the navy when they come in, "that the fund of the Dunkirk money may remain entire."<sup>56</sup> This may have represented either an honest endeavor against overwhelming odds or a hypocritical attempt at favorable publicity for the Clarendon clique against the growing opposition. The chancellor was not yet building his fatal palace at the junction of St. James and Piccadilly but he was possibly known to be planning it, for the land grant had been made by the king four months before.<sup>57</sup>

Fortunate had it been for Charles II if this were the end, however inglorious, of this early instance of international finance. But it was not; for Louis XIV was to use this large payment as an excuse for not continuing subsidies to England for assisting Portugal. "Upon his Majesty's receipt of so much money from Dunkirk," Letellier told Montagu, the English ambassador, "he would be sufficiently enabled to relieve Portugal." Clarendon protested in a memorial of January, 1663, that "all care had been taken to remove any possible imagination that any part of the money which should be received from Dunkirk could be applied towards the relief of Portugal."<sup>58</sup> D'Estrades' letters, however, tend to refute this statement. The two things had probably not been kept wholly separate

preceding pages is about £343,000. But an indeterminate amount of this represents a second using of the money after being returned by the first recipient. This total is distributed as follows:

Army.....	£148,639
Navy.....	120,000
Royal household, etc.....	67,000
Mint repairs.....	1,600
Pensions and salaries.....	5,500
Total.....	£342,739

<sup>56</sup> *Cal. st. ps., dom., 1664-65*, p. 41.

<sup>57</sup> T. H. Lister, *Life of Clarendon* (London, 1837), III, 525-26.

<sup>58</sup> Public Record Office, State Papers Foreign, France, 117, fols. 16-21. Cf. copy in Archives des Affaires Étrangères, Angleterre, 79, fols. 47-50.



in the discussions. D'Estrades' letter of September 8 stated that Charles needed the five million livres at once for debts and ten ships for Portugal;<sup>59</sup> and there are other similar injections of the question of Portuguese relief into the Dunkirk negotiations. At any rate, France paid no more to England for the prosecution of the war in Portugal.<sup>60</sup> Perhaps one should therefore subtract from the amount actually received for Dunkirk—4,654,000 livres—the Portuguese subsidies for which it served as a substitute—1,500,000 livres<sup>61</sup>—in order to arrive at the net price—3,154,000 livres—or a little under two-thirds of the usually stated five millions. Louis XIV gave Colbert's daughter a dowry of nearly half that much.<sup>62</sup>

Nevertheless, the payment was a rather heavy one for the young Bourbon king, coming as it did in a year of notoriously poor crops; and it is probable that thorough investigation of contemporary French finances would show that the treasury felt it for some little time. A *don gratuit* of 300,000 livres was asked of Bourgogne,<sup>63</sup> and one of 2,500,000 livres of Languedoc.<sup>64</sup> The estates of the latter province put up a stiff resistance with partial success. They had never before paid more than 1,500,000 livres. At the first presentation of this demand they would promise only 1,200,000 livres, and their supporting argument was a good one. Although 1,500,000 had been voted and paid the preceding year, they had actually raised only 1,000,000, the rest being borrowed. Now, since conditions of crops and trade were worse than during the preceding year, they should

<sup>59</sup> Lemaire, pp. 80-84.

<sup>60</sup> France continued to assist Portugal, but it was not done via England. It should be added in defense of Louis XIV that the Portuguese probably requested the more direct form of payment, fearing that all the money would not get through England. See E. Prestage, *Diplomatic relations of Portugal, 1640-68* (Watford, 1925), p. 81; and *Recueil des instructions données aux ambassadeurs ... Portugal* (Paris, 1886), p. 93.

<sup>61</sup> France had promised 2,000,000 livres, and had paid the first quarter in Feb. 1662. See the writer's "Anglo-Portuguese marriage of 1662," in *Hispanic American historical review*, X (1930), 330, 351-52.

<sup>62</sup> J. Boulanger, *Seventeenth century* (London, 1920), p. 333.

<sup>63</sup> Depping, *op. cit.*, I, 90.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89. For the details of this incident see the correspondence in *ibid.*, pp. 89-118; and cf. Bouchet, *op. cit.*, pp. 265-78.

surely not be expected to raise more than they did then. Nevertheless, as an expression of good will they would add 200,000. But the intendant, Besons, and the king's representative, Prince de Conti, would not let them off at that, and after much further haranguing, the estates raised their offer to 1,600,000 livres—with a condition, however, that only 1,400,000 should be "pour le don gratuit," and the rest "pour Donkerque." "It would be dangerous," the Archbishop of Toulouse explained to Colbert, to pay 1,500,000 livres two years in succession for fear the court would seize the opportunity of fixing it there for all time."<sup>65</sup> The harassed intendant did not quarrel on that point, believing "qu'il falloit prendre la maxime des Allemands qui *non curant de modo, dummodo habeant rem.*"<sup>66</sup> There were probably other such incidents. And perhaps Colbert dispatched many letters, like that of December 1, 1662, to the governor of Languedoc, in which he expressed regret that, owing to the purchase of Dunkirk, soldiers' pay for the next three months as well as some other obligations would have to be deferred.<sup>67</sup>

CLYDE L. GROSE

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

<sup>65</sup> Letter of Dec. 23 in Depping, *op. cit.*, I, 111.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>67</sup> Clément, *op. cit.*, IV, 7.

## HOW THE FRENCH DEPUTIES WERE PAID IN 1789-91<sup>1</sup>

**I**N AUGUST, 1789, the National Assembly faced a crisis. Many of the deputies, especially the *curés*, financially embarrassed, were confronted by the dilemma of either securing money with which to live in Versailles or of returning to their homes, leaving unfinished the work of giving to France a constitution.

The issue was not without its significance upon the personal side, nor was it without interest upon the side of politics. For four months the deputies had been at Versailles, where expenses were high; and although some had been paid by their constituents, many had not received a franc from their electoral districts for either traveling or living expenses. Their resources were exhausted, debts had been contracted, and no funds were in sight with which to pay them. Their own integrity and the success of the revolution were in the balance. Something had to be done.

In their extremity some of the embarrassed deputies appealed to the financial committee for assistance.<sup>2</sup> The appeal confronted the committee with several difficulties. They were mindful of the royal instruction which placed the support of the deputies upon their local bailliages.<sup>3</sup> Also, they were painfully conscious of the depleted state of the royal treasury. At the same

<sup>1</sup> Research paper No. 187, "Journal Series," University of Arkansas.

<sup>2</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances de l'Assemblée constituante*, ed. Camille Bloch (2 vols.; Rennes, 1922), ("Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire économique de la Révolution française publiés par le ministère de l'instruction publique"), I, 17: "Un de messieurs a représenté que plusieurs députés, n'ayant reçu jusqu'ici aucun traitement de leurs provinces, se trouvaient dans un état de gêne qu'il croyait utile à la chose publique de faire cesser, et qu'il pensait que le comité des finances pourrait proposer un moyen de procurer à ces députés des acomptes faciles sur les sommes qu'ils ont droit d'attendre de leurs bailliages respectifs." [Quotations are reproduced exactly in spite of inaccuracies of spelling and grammar.]

<sup>3</sup> *Archives parlementaires, de 1787 à 1860*, ed. J. Mavidal and E. Laurent, Series I (1787 à 1799) (Paris, 1879), May 30, 1789, I, 629, 630.

time they sensed the fact that they were face to face with a crisis. Should the revolution fail because the deputies were not supported? Many hoped that it would. Enemies of revolutionary France abounded like the locusts in Egypt. The deputies must not be forced to return home for lack of funds.

The issue was so weighty that the committee placed patriotic considerations foremost, and decided on August 11 to put the question squarely up to the National Assembly. The Duc de Liancourt was selected to be the committee's spokesman,<sup>4</sup> and on August 12 he urged the assembly to provide a salary to be paid to each deputy, to allow traveling expenses to and from Versailles,<sup>5</sup> to provide a reasonable sum for residence in the city,<sup>6</sup> and proposed besides that the committee should confer with the minister of finance with reference to the best method of providing 1,500,000 livres to meet the immediate expenses of the deputies.<sup>7</sup>

Important though these recommendations were, they were not discussed by the members of the National Assembly. The *Courrier de Provence* affirms that the propositions were coldly received, and ascribes the cause to delicacy on the part of the members.<sup>8</sup> Undoubtedly, many did hesitate to speak because they were personally concerned, but Dodu thinks that affluent

<sup>4</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances de l'Assemblée constituante*, Aug. 11, 1789, I, 21, 22: "Il a été résolu que M. le duc de Liancourt qui en était l'auteur serait chargé, au nom du comité, de proposer à l'Assemblée nationale d'ordonner que le comité se concerta avec le ministre des finances et celui de la feuille des bénéfiques, pour aviser aux moyens de trouver dans la caisse des receveurs généraux et des économats une somme de quinze cent mille livres environ, qui suffirait aux acomptes que les députés pourraient désirer de toucher sur leurs traitement."

<sup>5</sup> *Procès verbal de l'Assemblée nationale de communes et de l'Assemblée nationale imprimé par son ordre* (75 vols.; Paris, 1789-91), Aug. 12, 1789, No. 48, p. 1; *Assemblée nationale* (35 vols.; Paris, 1789-92), Aug. 27, 1789, II, 514.

<sup>6</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 12, 1789, No. 48, p. 1.

<sup>7</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Aug. 11, 1789, I, 21, 22; *Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 12, 1789, II, 515: "Enfin qu'il serait établi comité de quatre personnes pour s'entendre avec le ministre de la feuille et des finances, pour aviser au moyen de payer ce traitement."

<sup>8</sup> *Courrier de Provence. Lettres de M. le comte de Mirabeau à ses commettans* (18 vols.; Paris, 1789-91), No. 27, p. 1. Number 27 is not dated, but No. 26 is dated Aug. 8-10, 1789, and No. 28 is dated Aug. 17-19, 1789. Therefore No. 27 is between these dates.

aristocrats remained silent because they saw in the defeat of these measures an opportunity to diminish the influence of the common deputies by letting them become involved in financial difficulties.<sup>9</sup> Mirabeau championed the cause of the impoverished deputies in his newspaper. He thought the question too closely related to public welfare not to merit the attention of the people. Therefore, he took his constituents to a great height, somewhat after a famous biblical example, and showed them, if not all the kingdoms of the world, at least the possibility of the French nation securing as leaders men who were in sympathy with the revolutionary ideals of 1789 and who could be kept loyal to these sentiments, provided the nation arose to its possibilities and supplied the deputies with adequate financial support. France, however, could do as England had done—not recompense its national representatives, thus excluding patriotic citizens of humble means from public service, and the government would be run by the rich upper classes, who would provide for their own support by mulcting the public.<sup>10</sup>

The conservative attitude of the Assembly was finally overcome by referring the question for immediate action to the thirty bureaux into which the Assembly was divided.<sup>11</sup> It was now obvious that the revolution would have to be won in the bureaux as well as in the National Assembly. How would the deputies react to this opportunity both to insure the success of the revolution and to recoup their neglected finances? Their votes alone would tell.

When the members assembled (August 29–31) in their respective bureaux, their patriotic temper was soon manifest. The motion of the Duc de Liancourt was sent to all the bureaux, where it was emphatically endorsed by the vote of 822. Of this number, 432 fixed the daily remuneration at 18 francs, which was to begin on April 27, 1789. The principle of equality was so deeply entrenched that no distinction was made in the payment

<sup>9</sup> Gaston Jacques Dodu, *Le parlementarisme et les parlementaires sous la Révolution (1789–1799)* (Paris, 1911), p. 11.

<sup>10</sup> *Courrier de Provence*, No. 27, pp. 1–4.

<sup>11</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 12, 1789, No. 48, p. 1.

of the different members attending the National Assembly. Five francs a post was to be allowed as traveling expenses to and from the estates general.<sup>12</sup>

On September 1, 1789, the National Assembly endorsed the action taken by the bureaux and authorized the minister of finance to pay each deputy his salary for the four months prior to August 27 at the rate of 18 francs a day and to allow 5 francs a post for traveling expenses. It was further agreed that the deputies should, in the future, be paid their salaries month by month. The execution of this decree was entrusted to the financial committee, which was authorized to confer with Necker on the best way to provide the money.<sup>13</sup> This action of the Nation-

<sup>12</sup> Archives nationales, Paris, MSS, Sect. Leg. fol. 46. No. 1. C. Carton 27, dossier 1, 196. (Professor F. M. Fling kindly called my attention to this material, and I had photostatic copies made of the actions taken by each of the bureaux.) "Depouillement des voix dans les bureaux pour le traitement des deputes. De 822 personnes qui ont leurs vaux sur le traitement des deputes.

432=ont pensé qui le devoient, etre fixes	a . . . . .	18'' [francs]
286 l'ont fixé . . . . .	a . . . . .	15''
28 . . . . .	a . . . . .	12''
55 . . . . .	a . . . . .	20''
1 . . . . .	a . . . . .	16''
1 . . . . .	a . . . . .	21''
19 . . . . .	a . . . . .	24''

quant aux frais des 30 bureaux 5 ont pensé qu'il fallait accorder par poste . . . . . 6''

12 ont fixé cette somme	5''
1 la fixé a . . . . .	4''—16
1 autre—a . . . . .	4''—10
11 . . . . . a . . . . .	4''

Tous les bureaux sont convenus de fixer l'époque au 27 avril et de n'admettre aucune distinction dans le traitement des députés."

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 46: "Assemblée Nationale du 1er, Septembre 1789 à la séance du soir. Assemblée Nationale délibérant sur le résultat des differens bureaux relatif aux moyens d'assurer à Messieurs les députés le remboursement de leurs dépenses, a autorisé le Ministre des finances à faire payer dans cette Ville de Versailles, à chacun de Messieurs les députés les quatre mois et leur traitement échus le vingt-sept août dernier et les frais de route, le tout d'après le réglement qu'elle a précédemment fait à cet égard savoir chaque jour et traitement à raison de dix-huit livres, et chaque poste à raison de cinq livres.

"Elle apareillement autorisé à compter à l'avenir, à chacun de Messieurs, de mois en mois les sommes de traitement échues.

"Elle a ordonné que tous ces payemens seront portés et alloués dans les comptes

al Assembly implied a determination to prevent the financial crisis from interfering with the work of the revolution.

Liancourt, representing the committee, took council with the minister of finance and reported back that the royal treasury was not able to take care of the entire expense at once, but that it would be possible to pay only the first month's salary and that the rest would be paid in proportion to the successful floating of a loan.<sup>14</sup> Although both the loan of August 9<sup>15</sup> and that of August 27 failed,<sup>16</sup> the government borrowed from the *caisse d'escompte*,<sup>17</sup> in order to meet its operating expenses and to pay the deputies until the government could be supported by the sale of confiscated lands and the collection of taxes.

Although the deputies became official representatives to the estates general on April 27, it was the middle of September before they received their first pay check from the French government, and this included only their traveling expenses and salaries for the month of May.<sup>18</sup> When the deputies received

---

en vertu du présent décret et en rapportant par les comptables les quittances qui leur auront été délivrées.

"L'Assemblée charge son comité des finances de concerter avec le ministre l'exécution du présent décret."

*Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Sept. 2, 1789, I, 31, 32. "Il a été fait lecture d'un décret de l'Assemblée nationale sur le traitement des députés, dont elle a renvoyé l'exécution au comité des finances."

"Resolu: que M. le duc de Liancourt se concertera avec M. Necker pour cet objet, et en rendra compte au prochain Comité."

<sup>14</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Sept. 4, 1789, I, 32.

<sup>15</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 9, 1789, II, No. 45, p. 2; *Point du jour* (27 vols.; Paris, 1789-91), Aug. 9, 1789, II, No. 48, p. 76. The National Assembly voted a loan of 30,000,000 francs: *Mémoire envoyé à l'Assemblée nationale sur Necker*, p. 1 (bound with *Procès-verbal*, Aug. 27, 1789, IV, No. 60); *Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 27, 1789, III, No. 9, p. 137. Only 2,600,000 livres was realized.

<sup>16</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 27, 1789, II, No. 60, p. 6; *Point du jour*, Aug. 25, 1789, II, No. 63, p. 231. This loan was for 80,000,000 livres.

<sup>17</sup> *Rapport sur la caisse d'escompte fait à l'Assemblée nationale, le 4 décembre, par ses commissaires*, p. 39, bound with *Procès-verbal*, Dec. 4, 1789, VIII, 142.

<sup>18</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Sept. 16, 1789, I, 38: "M. le duc de Liancourt après avoir rendu compte des mandats qu'il avait donnés et fait distribuer dans les bureaux pour le payement du traitement dû à M. M. les députés pour leur route et pour le courant du mois de mai, a prié le comité de vouloir bien le faire suppléer dans

their first remuneration, the Comte de Toustain de Viray sounded a note of warning, urging that, since the Assembly's mission was to reform abuses and give France a constitution, the deputies should be careful not to establish another abuse in their favor. Therefore he would limit the time for which the deputies would be paid to six months. This caution was frequently offered during the days of the Constituent Assembly, but was objected to on the ground that the commons, and especially the clergy, who had only received 500 livres a year, were unable to make this sacrifice.<sup>19</sup>

Emigrations, resignations,<sup>20</sup> sick leave,<sup>21</sup> and appointments to other positions<sup>22</sup> changed the original 1,200 deputies and reduced their number; but Liancourt was a busy man and was of the opinion that others less occupied than himself might look after the clerical work of signing the pay checks of the deputies. Nevertheless, he arranged for the deputies to receive their first checks, which included both traveling expenses and salary for the month of May. The checks were turned over to the various bureaus, which in turn distributed them to their several members. This transaction which had been delayed for four and a half months, much to the discomfiture of many of the deputies, and at the risk of defeating the revolution, was reported to the financial committee by the member who had so successfully engineered the project. The feat accomplished, Liancourt requested that the committee relieve him of the monthly responsibility of seeing that more than a thousand checks, provided by the national treasury, were properly signed and distributed to the members of the National Assembly.<sup>23</sup>

---

ses fonctions par un autre de ses membres pour la distribution des mandats du mois suivant."

<sup>19</sup> *Archives parlementaires*, Sept. 16, 1789, IX, 16.

<sup>20</sup> Armand Brette, *Les constituants, liste des députés et des suppléants élus à l'Assemblée constituante de 1789* (Paris, 1897), pp. 275-78.

<sup>21</sup> *Assemblée nationale*, April 23, 1790, X, 469, 470.

<sup>22</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Oct. 27, 1790, No. 454, p. 3. About 100 members of the National Assembly were named as judges of districts. Not all accepted, but many did and resigned from the Assembly.

<sup>23</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Sept. 16, 1789, I, 38.



On October 8, the financial committee to whom the Assembly had assigned the task of providing the money with which to pay the deputies, decided that all salary checks should be signed by a member of the financial committee, and that in order to lighten this work, a different member should affix his name each month. In harmony with this arrangement, inasmuch as Liancourt had signed the checks for the month of May, the Marquis de Montesquiou was to do the same for June, M. d'Ailly for July, the Duc d'Aiguillon for August, Lablache for September,<sup>24</sup> Anson for October, the Marquis de Gouy for November,<sup>25</sup> and the Baron d'Allard for December.<sup>26</sup>

Numerous difficulties began at once to confront the committee. Many members were absent from Paris. On April 25, 1790, the National Assembly stated that no session was held where there were not two or three and sometimes five or six requests for leave of absence.<sup>27</sup> Two months later, it was reported on the floor of the Assembly, that more than 300 deputies were absent, some having been away from two to three months, others as long as six months, though their salaries continued as usual.<sup>28</sup>

Impatient with the number of deputies absent and the continual requests for permission to leave the Assembly, many members expressed their disapproval of existing conditions and proposed such corrective measures as demanding the early return of absent members, the refusal of permission for others to leave, the withholding of their salaries, and the dismissal of absent members and their replacement by substitutes.<sup>29</sup> The sentiment continued to grow that absent deputies should not be regarded

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, Oct. 8, 1789, I, 44.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 11, 1789, I, 53, 54.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1789, I, 105.

<sup>27</sup> *Assemblée nationale*, April 23, 1790, X, 469, 470.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, June 22, 1790, XII, No. 28, 436, 437; *Archives parlementaires*, April 25, 1790, XV, 288: "Il en est qui sont absents depuis quatre à cinq mois; il en est même qui sont domiciliés à Paris, et qui depuis six mois, n'ont pas assisté à une seule séance." *Ibid.*, April 2, 1791, XXIV, 505: "M. Deschamps député du département de Rhône-et-Loire est absent depuis de 8 mois de l'Assemblée; nous recevons journellement des lettres qui nous annoncent qu'il cherche à détruire à Lyon tout ce que fait l'Assemblée nationale pour le bien général."

<sup>29</sup> *Assemblée nationale*, April 23, 1790, X, 470, 471; *Archives parlementaires*, April 25, 1790, XV, 287, 288.

as the nation's representatives and should be deprived of their salaries during the time that they were away from the Assembly. Finally on June 22, 1790, a decree was enacted which deprived such members of compensation.<sup>30</sup>

Meanwhile the financial committee wrestled with the problem: what should be done about the checks of absent members, which were still in the hands of the secretaries of the bureaux. A committee of two, Kÿtspotter<sup>31</sup> and the Abbé de la Salcette, was therefore named to confer with the secretaries of the various bureaux and determine the bona fide members. This action, important as it was, left unsolved the disposition to be made of all unclaimed checks. This question hung fire until the end of December, when the financial committee decided to withdraw the checks which had accumulated since September in the thirty bureaux, and the task was assigned to Gaultier and Kÿtspotter.<sup>32</sup>

Another question that concerned both the Assembly and the financial committee was that of the substitute deputies, who wanted both pay and recognition, and took advantage of every opportunity to plead their cause. Five hundred and eighty-one *suppléants* had been elected in the winter and spring of 1789.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée*, June 22, 1790, No. 327, p. 5; *Journal des débats*, June 21, 1790, No. 319, p. 2; *Assemblée nationale*, June 22, 1790, XII, No. 28, 438. *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Nov. 23, 1789, I, 63: "On a observé que plusieurs membres de l'Assemblée étaient absents, que cependant on avait remis aux secrétaires des différents bureaux le nombre complet de bons sur le Trésor Royal pour le traitement des députés; qu'il était certainement dans les sentiments et dans les principes de tous de ne rien recevoir quand ils ne remplissaient pas leurs fonctions; qu'en conséquence, nombre de bons devaient être restés dans les mains des secrétaires." *Point du jour*, June 23, 1790, No. 341, p. 169: "Le traitement de députés absents, ne sera pas payé à ceux qui se sont absentés et qui s'absenteront: et ce, pendant tout le temps de leur absence." *Archives parlementaires*, June 22, 1790, XVI, 405: "On va se promener pour cabaler contre la constitution; voyez si nous voulons les payer pour ce beau service."

<sup>31</sup> Brette, *op. cit.*, p. 231, spells the name "Kÿtspotter"; and the *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, I, 63, spells it "Kirtspoter."

<sup>32</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Nov. 23, 1789, I, 63; Dec. 28, 1789, p. 105: "M. le comte de Lablache a proposé de faire rapporter et annuler les mandats qui n'avaient pas été retirés ou qui avaient été rapportés au secrétariat."

"M. M. Gaultier et Kÿtspotter ont été chargés de se faire remettre les mandats non retirés par les secrétaires des divers bureaux."

<sup>33</sup> Brette, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

Of this number, only 111 were selected to take the places of those deputies who had died or resigned.<sup>34</sup> The other 471 left no stone unturned to impress both the financial committee and the Assembly that they too were in attendance upon the Assembly at the command of their bailliages, and that as late as May, 1790, they had neither been compensated for the expenses to which they had been placed in reaching Paris nor paid a salary for the twelve months that they had been away from their homes. Although the feeling prevailed in the committee and the Assembly that the bailliages had exceeded their right to send at the expense of the nation others than those called for in the letters of convocation,<sup>35</sup> whenever a substitute deputy was recommended by the committee on verification to take a place made vacant by the death or resignation of a regular deputy, the Assembly seated him,<sup>36</sup> after he had subscribed to the civic oath.<sup>37</sup> After being made regular deputies, the former substitutes asked for and received their traveling expenses and salaries for the period which they served. To avoid having the nation pay traveling expenses more than once for the representatives of a bailliage, it was decided that such expense should be borne by the principal deputy and be deducted from the last month's salary of the deputies who resigned or for any other reason ceased to serve in the Assembly.<sup>38</sup>

Although precautions had been taken to safeguard both the nation and the deputies in the handling of their salary checks, many difficulties arose speedily which caused the financial committee no end of trouble. Questionable checks were presented to the royal treasury. In order to eliminate this abuse, it was proposed that each deputation select one of its members to receive all the checks and to see that they passed into the

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 275-78.

<sup>35</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances de l'Assemblée constituante*, Feb. 1, 1790, I, 126, 127; *Procès-verbal*, Nov. 5, 1789, No. 117, p. 5: "L'élection des Suppléans n'aurait lieu que dans le cas de mort ou de démission des Députés."

<sup>36</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Aug. 3, 1790, No. 369, p. 6.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, February 4, 1790, No. 192, p. 23; Oct. 21, 1790, No. 448, p. 1.

<sup>38</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances de l'Assemblée constituante*, Jan. 8, 1790, I, 110; May 24, 1790, p. 244.

hands of their rightful owners. The committee in time adopted this course and recommended its use to the Assembly.

As forged checks continued to be presented, it was decided to print them with vouchers, and that the vouchers should be sent to the royal treasury in order that each check might be verified. M. de Canteleu was charged with the supervision of the proper preparation of all checks. This action was not to render invalid the many checks that had already been issued, which were to be cashed as in the past; but all issued in the future were to conform to the proposed instruction.

It soon developed that some deputies were suspected of receiving pay from both their local constituency and the royal treasury. A case of this kind was that of M. Bouche, whose check the treasury refused to cash on the ground that he had been paid by the province from which he came. Accordingly, the financial committee, after considering the incident, wrote to M. Gislin, of the treasury department, and instructed him to pay Bouche.<sup>39</sup> From subsequent actions it seems that the committee had in mind that the members would all be checked up, as the royal treasury was only temporarily meeting these expenses, which would later be referred to the districts and departments for action.<sup>40</sup>

Owing to the shortage of funds, the deputies' salaries continued in arrears throughout 1789 and 1790. Fortunately, money promised to be more plentiful in January, 1791, when the National Assembly decreed that all departments should pay the sums owed by them to the royal treasury. Many deputies in need of funds thought the time opportune to make demands and besought the Assembly and financial committee to pay the salaries due them.

Recognizing the justice of the request and the sanctity of the obligation which should have been met long before, the committee advised with the executive power and decided that the

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, Feb. 8, 1790, p. 132.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, May 31, 1790, p. 255: "Quant aux questions de savoir par qui ces dépenses devront être définitivement supportées, ainsi que les autres frais accessoires, ceux de voyage, séjour et retour des députés et [des] dit[e]s assemblées, le comité a décidé que le tout devait être renvoyé à l'avis des district et département."

state of the treasury would permit the liquidation of these obligations and took action to the effect that on February 1 the treasury should pay the deputies their salaries for the preceding months of October and November; on March 1 their checks should include the pay for the months of December and January; on April 1 the salaries for February and March should be paid; and so by May 1 they would reach the current month.<sup>41</sup> It is needless to say that this news was gladly received by deputies, who for almost two years had been among strangers. Many, as appears from the acts of the financial committee in the month of February, had become financially embarrassed. Considering the long absence from home, the strenuous work of the Constituent Assembly, and the financial depression experienced by many deputies, the fact that so few of them deserted speaks eloquently of the interest taken in completing the revolution and giving to France a constitution.

By February, 1791, numerous creditors began to demand that the National Assembly should protect them against loss through the failure of deputies to meet their obligations. This condition had been developing for many months, and the Assembly decreed as early as July 7, 1790, that creditors could exercise all their rights under the law, against deputies who were indebted to them.<sup>42</sup> The financial committee doubtlessly appreciated the situation, not only from the side of the deputies and their creditors, but also its significance to the revolution. Desiring to deal fairly with all, it continued to turn over the checks to their owners in spite of numerous protests and claims presented to the committee, and ruled that all creditors should present their claims before the officers of the royal treasury.

Without relinquishing its hold upon the finances, the com-

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, Jan. 10, 1791, II, 436: "L'Assemblée nationale ayant décrété le paiement de l'arriéré de tous les départements, plusieurs députés ont demandé que l'arriéré de leur indemnité leur fût acquittée."

"Le comité, de concert avec le pouvoir exécutif, et en considérant l'état actuel du Trésor public, a arrêté qu'au 1er février prochain, le Trésor public acquitterait les mandats d'octobre et de novembre; au 1er mars, ceux de décembre et janvier, et ainsi de suite de mois en mois jusqu'au 1er mai qu'on sera arrivé au courant."

<sup>42</sup> *Archives parlementaires*, July 7, 1790, XVI, 735.

mittee sent one of its members, Kytspotter, to consult with Gislin, the first commissioner of the royal treasury, and empowered the director to receive claims against the checks of the deputies. The president and Kytspotter were empowered to hold checks when creditors so demanded; and should the deputies insist that they be given their checks, a day would be set aside each week when they could appear before the committee and state their case. The committee thought that this policy would protect both the deputies, the creditors, and the National Assembly.<sup>43</sup>

Under such handicaps the hundreds of deputies who sat in the French Constituent Assembly from May, 1789, to the end of September, 1791, were paid. Probably many wealthy clergy, nobles, and bourgeois needed no financial assistance during this period; but there were parish priests and many members of the second and third estates whose incomes were most meager. It was, in fact, a period of great financial depression. France had nowhere any credit. Taxes and tithes ceased to be paid. Feudal dues were repudiated, chateaux destroyed, and church property confiscated. Business was dead, and currency disappeared from circulation. The number of dependent deputies is hypothetical; but judging from the amount of time devoted to the subject of their relief, by the overworked finance committee, it seems that the number was large. What representative group of 1,200 professional men today would leave their work and devote their time to any patriotic enterprise for two and one-half years without pay?

While each deputy received 18 francs a day, or approximately 540 livres a month, the number of deputies paid each month changed somewhat, owing to a variety of reasons, which we have already considered. Inasmuch as the financial committee paid the deputies month by month, and some of the records, though not all, are available, it is possible to follow the expenditures made by the nation to its representatives for the first two years. As the number of deputies attending the Assembly fluctuated, the pay checks varied.

<sup>43</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Feb. 7, 1791, II, 457.

Liancourt on August 12, 1789, estimated the immediate expenses, or probably one month's salary and traveling expenses to Versailles at 1,500,000 livres.<sup>44</sup> However, definite information is afforded in the report of the financial committee rendered by Anson on November 28, 1789, when he informed the National Assembly that the deputies' salaries for the last two months of the year would be 650,000 livres a month, or 1,300,000 livres.<sup>45</sup> The *Moniteur* affirms that a great number of deputies declared at the time that the sum was inadequate, that some had received nothing and others had been paid only for two or three months.<sup>46</sup>

A more satisfactory and informing statement of the amount paid the deputies for the last four months of 1789 and for the first four months of the year 1790 is contained in a memoir submitted by Necker to the National Assembly on July 21, 1790. Here the minister of finance itemizes the receipts and expenditures of the nation for the period from May 1, 1789, to April 30, 1790, and includes an item of 5,687,763 livres for traveling expenses and salaries paid to the deputies.<sup>47</sup> In another financial statement rendered on May 29, 1790,<sup>48</sup> Necker estimated the expenses of the deputies for the last eight months of 1790 at 4,800,000 livres,<sup>49</sup> or 600,000 livres a month. But this

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, Aug. 11, 1789, I, 21.

<sup>45</sup> Anson's report is bound with the *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, Dec. 4, 1789, No. 142; *Assemblée nationale*, Nov. 28, 1789, VI, No. 12, 182, says: "Indemnité des députés 650,000 livres pour chaque mois." *Courrier de Provence*, Nov. 27, 28, 1789, IV, No. 72, 13, states: "1,300,000 livres aux députés." *Archives parlementaires*, Nov. 28, 1789, X, 321, 322, records: "Indemnité des députés, 650,000 livres pour chaque mois." *Moniteur*, Nov. 28, 1789, II, No. 98, 253, 254, states: "Dans l'état présenté par M. Anson, se trouve une somme de 1,200,000 livres pour les indemnités dues aux députés pendant les mois de novembre et décembre."

<sup>46</sup> *Moniteur*, Nov. 28, 1789, II, No. 98.

<sup>47</sup> Report of Necker bound up with the *Procès-verbal*, July 20, 1790, No. 355, p. 16; *Archives parlementaires*, Aug. 24, 1790, XVIII, 249, 258. *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Jan. 10, 1791, II, 436, states that the salaries in 1791 were four months in arrears.

<sup>48</sup> *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée nationale*, May 29, 1790, No. 303, pp. 4, 5; *Journal des débats*, No. 292, pp. 5, 6; *Assemblée nationale*, May 29, 1790, XII, No. 6, 86; *Point du jour*, May 30, 1790, 273.

<sup>49</sup> Report of finance committee bound up with *Procès-verbal*, May 29, 1790, No. 303, pp. 11, 13; *Archives parlementaires*, May 29, 1790, XV, 712, 720; B. J. B. Buchez and

estimate was changed the next year, when Dufresne's statement showed that the salaries paid the deputies from May to December, 1790, actually reached the sum of 5,221,359 livres,<sup>50</sup> or a little over 652,000 livres a month. The first three months of 1791 the deputies were paid 3,019,121 livres.<sup>51</sup> This sum, however, includes pay for more than three months, because salaries of the deputies were four months in arrears<sup>52</sup> and the Assembly was making a desperate effort to bring them up to date. The salaries paid in April, 1791, amounted to 726,603 livres,<sup>53</sup> while 603,555 livres were paid in May<sup>54</sup> and 548,237 livres<sup>55</sup> in June.

From the foregoing figures it is evident that the traveling expenses paid to Versailles, and the salaries from May 1, 1789, to July 1, 1791, amounted to 15,806,638 livres.<sup>56</sup>

No financial statements have been found for the months of

P. C. Roux, *Histoire parlementaire de la Révolution française* (40 vols.; Paris, 1834), June 9, 1790, VI, 239, 247.

<sup>50</sup> Bound up with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 16, 1789, No. 76, *Pièces justificatives*, No. 3, p. 20. *Archives parlementaires*, Sept. 9, 1790, XXX, 355, 359.

<sup>51</sup> Financial statement bound up with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 9, 1791, No. 761. *Pièces justificatives*, No. 4, p. 42: "Dépenses [trois premiers mois 1791]," Sept. 9, 1791 ... Indemnité à M. M. les députés de l'assemblée, *Archives parlementaires*, XXX, Sept. 9, 1791, XXX, 364.

<sup>52</sup> *Procès-verbaux du comité des finances*, Sept. 16, 1789, I, 38.

<sup>53</sup> Financial statement submitted to the National Assembly in September, 1791, showing the expenses for April, 1791, bound with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 9, 1791, No. 761, *Pièces justificatives*, No. 4, p. 55; *Archives parlementaires*, XXX, Sept. 9, 1791, 373.

<sup>54</sup> Financial statement bound with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 9, 1791, No. 761, *Pièces justificatives*, No. 4, p. 65; *Archives parlementaires*, Sept. 9, 1791, XXX, 379.

<sup>55</sup> Financial statement bound with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 9, 1791, No. 761, *Pièces justificatives*, No. 4, p. 77; *Archives parlementaires*, Sept. 9, 1791, XXX, 385.

<sup>56</sup> September to December, 1789; January to May

1, 1789.....	5,687,763
May 1 to Dec. 31, 1790.....	5,221,359
Three months of 1791 and some pay toward May,	
June, July, and August, 1789.....	3,019,121
April, 1791.....	726,603
May, 1791.....	603,555
June, 1791.....	548,237

15,806,638 Livres



July, August, and September, 1791. But the amounts paid the deputies for salary ranged from 548,235<sup>57</sup> livres to 652,669 livres<sup>58</sup> per month. If the deputies were paid the lowest amount, or 548,235 livres a month, for the last three months that the Constituent Assembly convened, the total for these three months would amount to 1,644,705 livres. This, added to the sum paid up to July 1, 1791, would make a grand total of 17,451,343; and this does not take into consideration the sum necessary to return the deputies to their homes after the constitution was completed and the Assembly had adjourned *sine die*.

It is a fairly safe estimate that the cost of drawing up the constitution of 1791 in salaries and traveling expense alone was not much less than 19,000,000 livres, or about \$3,800,000, at a time when money had a much greater purchasing power than today. Though many of the reforms of the Constituent Assembly continue at the present time, the constitution was scrapped in less than a year.

C. L. BENSON

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

<sup>57</sup> The sum paid for June, 1791, financial statement bound up with the *Procès-verbal*, No. 761, *Pièces justificatives*, No. 4, p. 77.

<sup>58</sup> The average paid during the last eight months of 1790, financial statement bound up with the *Procès-verbal*, Sept. 9, 1791, No. 761, *Pièces justificatives; ibid.*, No. 3, p. 30; *Archives parlementaires*, Sept. 9, 1791, XXX, 355, 359.

## CALEB CUSHING AND THE TREATY OF WANGHIA, 1844

**A**LTHOUGH much has been written on the mission of Caleb Cushing to China in 1843 and the conclusion of the Treaty of Wanghia in the following year, yet the students of Sino-American diplomacy have generally failed to give an adequate account of the circumstances of the negotiation.<sup>1</sup> The recent publication of *Ch'ou pau yi wu shih mo* [*The beginning and end of the management of barbarian affairs*]<sup>2</sup> brings to light many important materials with which, and the data already available, we are now able to reconstruct the story of the treaty.

It was on May 8, 1843, when the government of the United States had learned fully of the situation in the East following the close of the Opium War and the successful negotiation of the Treaty of Nanking, that Caleb Cushing received his appointment as "commissioner to China and envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to the Court of that empire." The instructions to Cushing authorized him first of all to endeavor to secure the entry of American vessels into the ports of Ningpo, Amoy, Fuchow, and Shanghai "on terms as favorable as those which are enjoyed by English merchants." Then, he was to conduct himself with great prudence and address in his dealings with the Chinese authorities, while in the meantime he was to assert and maintain the dignity of his own country. In the third place, he was to petition for access to the

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia* (New York, 1922); K. S. Latourette, "The history of early relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XXII (1917), 1-209; F. R. Dulles, *The old China trade* (Boston, 1930); and Claude M. Fuess, *The life of Caleb Cushing* (New York, 1923). Mr. Fuess's book contains much interesting material taken from the Cushing papers, while the work of Mr. Dennett draws largely on the documents in the department of state. A combination of the two would have greatly improved the result of their task, but neither of them has attempted it.

<sup>2</sup> This work is referred to below as *Yi wu shih mo*. For a review of it, see *American historical review*, XXXVI (1931), 870-71.

emperor and his court in Peking "so long as may be becoming and proper." He was also instructed to control the American merchants in China in regard to opium smuggling; and, lastly, although he was not to interfere with the relations between China and other nations, yet he should always display before the Chinese the power, dignity, even omnipotence, of the United States. Stripped of all verbiage, Cushing's instructions required him to perform one supreme task—to negotiate a treaty with China whereby the same privileges as had lately been acquired by the British would be secured for the American merchants. All other items were quite secondary in importance.<sup>3</sup>

Cushing embarked at Washington on July 31, 1843, and after a long voyage of 208 days his ship cast anchor on February 24, 1844, in Macao Roads; three days afterward he landed at Macao. About four months before Cushing's arrival, in October, 1843, the American consul in Canton, Paul S. Forbes, had reported the coming of an envoy from his country to Peking to the imperial commissioner, Kiyung,<sup>4</sup> who was then in Canton. Kiyung promptly answered: "Why go to Peking when the imperial commissioner is already at Canton, and when the Americans have already been given all the advantages in trade which have been conceded to the English?"<sup>5</sup> While Kiyung thus ordered Forbes to stop the envoy from coming, he was highly doubtful whether it was feasible to do so, as he was told that the envoy was already on the way.<sup>6</sup> He waited at Canton till December 1,

<sup>3</sup> *Senate documents*, 138, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 1-7.

<sup>4</sup> Also spelled as "Tsiyeng" or "Kiyeng."

<sup>5</sup> *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Book 69, pp. 35-36; Dennett, *op. cit.*, p. 147. It is interesting to note that Forbes's report led Kiyung to the conclusion that England and the United States were acting in concert to extort privileges from China. In his memorial to the emperor, received in Peking on November 15, 1843, he wrote: "The additional stipulation inserted by the English in the supplementary treaty [of October 8, 1843, that should China grant additional privileges to other nations, the same will be extended to the British subjects] has been made because they well know that the Americans are petitioning to repair to Peking and wish to reserve ground [for future aggression]. And how can we be sure that they are not contriving with one another, making America appear first to have a trial?" Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Book 69, p. 38. It took from 20 to 25 days for a memorial to go from Canton to Peking at that time.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, Bk. 69, p. 36.

1843, when, hearing no news about the American mission, he retired to Peking.<sup>7</sup>

At the time when Cushing arrived, therefore, Kiyung was not in Canton. The acting viceroy of the two Kwangs was Ching Yuhtsai, and with him Cushing naturally came into contact. Cushing's first communication to Ching, on February 27, was a step taken in perfect conformity with the instructions of his government: with much prudence he informed the Chinese official that, being on the way to Peking, he was to make a temporary stay at Macao until the frigate "Brandywine" had procured provisions, and inquired for the health of the emperor.<sup>8</sup> Meantime Cushing took up his abode in Macao on the Praya Grande and secured to his mission the aid of his countryman, Dr. Peter Parker, who had been for years a prominent missionary in Canton. But the most momentous event was the arrival of a letter from the American minister in London, Edward Everett, shortly after Cushing had settled down in Macao, which informed him that the Chinese government had agreed to grant the same privileges to all other nations as had been granted to the British.<sup>9</sup> In so far as Cushing's mission had its leading object in securing the entry of American vessels into the ports of Ningpo, Amoy, Fuchow, and Shanghai "on terms as favorable as those which are enjoyed by English merchants," there was hardly any need for him to proceed further after the arrival of this letter. Thus, at the very moment when the envoy was commencing his correspondence with the Chinese authorities, his mission was rendered almost useless by the nature of the events. What was meant to be done no longer needed to

<sup>7</sup> *Chinese repository*, XII (1843), 632. When Kiyung left Canton, he had arranged that, should the American envoy come to that city, the provincial authorities were to prevent him from going to Peking and "explain to him kindly in order to banish his vain expectations, and order him to return so that other nations may be prevented from following his example." These words are the keynote of Chinese foreign policy at that time. Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 70, p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 2.

<sup>9</sup> By Article VIII of the supplementary treaty with Great Britain of October 8, 1843. Mr. Fuess simply mentions the arrival of the letter but has not discussed its significance. *Op. cit.*, I, 425-26.

be done.<sup>10</sup> It is hard to tell what effect the coming of this letter had on Cushing. But a few things seem undoubtedly to have happened. In the first place, Cushing was driven to lay particular stress on that part of his instructions which required him to present the president's letter in Peking.<sup>11</sup> Secondly, the opinion of J. M. Forbes, a Boston merchant in the China trade, given upon Webster's request in April, 1843, that the Chinese would permit intercourse with foreign nations only "through fear of armed compulsion, or through a politic desire to offer us *voluntarily* what has been *forced* upon them by others. . . .," was now fully proved by facts.<sup>12</sup> And, thirdly, although the extension of commercial privileges had been definitely provided for in the Anglo-Chinese treaty, logically Cushing could still find room for negotiating a treaty between the United States and China, which, under the existing circumstances, might secure additional concessions for the United States, though they were hardly expected by his instructions.<sup>13</sup> All these considerations tended to lead Cushing to the belief that to deal with a government like the Chinese, vigorous, even aggressive, action was essential, and make him cease to conduct himself with "prudence and address" toward the Chinese government, as otherwise he would perchance have done.

While these events were transpiring, the acting viceroy, Ching, was greatly embarrassed by Cushing's dispatch of February 27. It was his bounden duty to detain the envoy on the frontier, as Kiyung had reminded him when retiring from Canton in December.<sup>14</sup> Meantime he was aware that the Americans were intrepid; he was afraid lest their man-of-war should sud-

<sup>10</sup> It was at this time that a correspondent at Canton wrote: "As Americans, we are now on the very *best* terms possible with the Chinese; . . . I cannot see what Mr. Cushing expects to do." *Niles' national register*, LXVII (September 21, 1844), 36.

<sup>11</sup> See above.

<sup>12</sup> Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 417; J. M. Forbes, *Letters and recollections* (Boston, 1899), I, 115.

<sup>13</sup> The Chinese authorities repeatedly expressed the opinion—and without distorting the fact—that Cushing's proceedings were with a view to surpass the English. See footnotes 15, 24, and 60.

<sup>14</sup> See footnote 7.

denly appear in the North; and he felt compelled by the time and circumstances to handle the matter with great caution.<sup>15</sup> Thrice he sent a representative to see Dr. Parker, hoping to get an inkling of Cushing's instructions, while Parker "merely smiled in answer to interrogations."<sup>16</sup> Thereupon, Ching decided to address a memorial to the emperor about the matter,<sup>17</sup> and to detain the envoy on the spot until the imperial will would be known. In his answer to Cushing, dated March 19, he politely rejected the latter's idea of proceeding to Peking, for he explained that it had been the custom of the country that foreign envoys were required to wait at the frontier until the imperial will should be known whether the interview might be permitted; that to proceed hastily to Tientsin is "to put an end to civility, and to rule without harmony"; that he was expected to learn from Forbes the orders given by Kiyung in October; and finally, that since China and the United States were at peace, there was no necessity of negotiating a treaty.<sup>18</sup>

It is an oft-repeated truism that after the Opium War and

<sup>15</sup> Ching's memorial about the request of Cushing to repair to Peking, which was received in Peking on April 9, 1844, contains the following: "I, your minister, understand that during the last hundred odd years that the Americans came to trade at Canton, they had not sent any tribute to our Court. Now the envoy Cushing requests permission to proceed to Peking, carrying with him the title of minister plenipotentiary and also instructions to negotiate the rules of friendly intercourse and to conclude a treaty of peace and amity. From this it is apparent that his intention is to follow the example of the English barbarians and further to surpass them. Hitherto the trade of the Americans had been very peaceful, and they had never had any trouble with China. Therefore, it is not likely that any disorderly thing will happen [in the present matter]. But the said envoy does not present himself at my provincial capital. Taking advantage of the monsoon, his vessel may reach Tientsin in about ten days. Should it happen that I, the provincial authority at Canton, have not reported to Your Majesty and yet the barbarian vessel suddenly appears in the sea-ports near the Capital, it will cause great anxiety. Further, I fear that since there is much unfamiliarity with the barbarian sentiments, it may give rise to disputes. Considering that the crisis of the barbarian affairs is just over and that the situation at present is different from that of the past, I, your minister, deem it important to keep the barbarians under restraint at present and then, gradually proceed to control them." Translated from *Yi uu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 71, pp. 8-9.

<sup>16</sup> Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 427.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 15. Also *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 28.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 2-5.

the Treaty of Nanking China's seclusion was broken down.<sup>19</sup> While it is true, if one takes into consideration the events of later years, yet it is not warranted by facts in regard to the period immediately following the Treaty of Nanking. The fact is that in the first peace settlement with foreign powers the Chinese government was driven to a desperate endeavor to maintain its traditional status and to hold fast its traditional policy of seclusion. The era of "diplomacy," in the Western sense of the word, had not yet come.<sup>20</sup> At the time when Cushing was at Canton requesting permission to proceed to Peking, the Chinese authorities, on the one hand, were seized by the fear of foreigners inherited from the war just over, and, on the other hand, found it difficult—even impossible—to readjust themselves all of a sudden to the changed order.<sup>21</sup> In consequence, the Chinese governmental policy at that time—no matter whether it was effective or futile—was one which endeavored to keep foreigners peacefully at the farthest possible borders of the country.<sup>22</sup>

This was the dominant note in the ensuing correspondence between Ching and Cushing. In his communication of March 23, Cushing insisted on going to Peking, expressing his willingness to take a route other than that by sea.<sup>23</sup> On April 1, Ching presented another memorial to the emperor, reporting the urgent request of Cushing to go north.<sup>24</sup> The document is illus-

<sup>19</sup> See, for example, *Chinese repository*, XIII (1844), 386.

<sup>20</sup> See footnote 7. The policy of Ching toward Cushing was to "soothe and stop" him. See Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 427. See also *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 2-5.

<sup>21</sup> See footnote 15.

<sup>22</sup> About March 22, 1844, Dr. Parker wrote Cushing that the Chinese government, dreading his going north, was purposely causing delay "till the N. E. monsoon shall impede your progress thither." See Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 428. See also *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 29-30.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5-7.

<sup>24</sup> This memorial in part reads: "I, your minister, find that the said envoy, Cushing, still petitions to go to Peking, despite our explanation and endeavor to stop him last time. Although his words are uttered with propriety, yet his mind is very obstinate. But, upon examining what he said in his return despatch about his willingness to go to Peking by the inner rivers, although I cannot permit it, yet it appears that he will not proceed just now. But he also remarked that he would negotiate only with the imperial commissioner and would not treat with other officials. Probing the meaning thereof, it appears that he is competing with the English barbarians, expecting to conclude a

trative of the situation: while little remained for Cushing to do except to emphasize his request to proceed to Peking,<sup>25</sup> the request—because of the peculiar character of Chinese foreign policy at that time—touched the very point which obsessed the Chinese authorities. Accordingly, on the same day when Ching addressed his memorial to Peking, he asked Cushing “to await at Canton the imperial will pointing out the proper course of procedure.”<sup>26</sup>

Then, Cushing inquired of Ching as to when an answer from the court might reach Canton and in which part of Kwangtung he should reside.<sup>27</sup> To these queries Ching replied that the envoy should reside and wait at the Legation House at Macao until he could be informed when the imperial commissioner would come to Canton.<sup>28</sup> By April 9, Ching's first memorial had reached the court. An imperial edict issued on that day shows that the Chinese government abhorred the coming of foreigners and strove to keep them on the farthest frontier.<sup>29</sup> In the edict

---

similar treaty, which would be to them a token of the favor from the Celestial Empire. Therefore he quite slights the commercial regulations. Although we are still stopping him, yet we are afraid that he will not obey our orders. The said envoy, having come to China after a long voyage, would hardly consent to sail home if we did not exercise some benevolent control over him. As I was afraid lest any discontent should arise with him, I had had a confidential communication with Kiyung, the viceroy of Liang Kiang, when I last received the communication from the said envoy, with a view to making preparations beforehand. I am notifying the said envoy to await at Canton and follow your imperial will peacefully and without any improper actions. Besides that, as is right, I beg to submit this memorial respectfully to Your Majesty by speedy post.” Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao kuang, Bk. 71, pp. 15-16.

<sup>25</sup> In fact, at that time, Cushing seemed to be hesitating about what he should do. At the very moment when he represented to Ching his urgent desire to go north, “being unwilling to allow the favorable season . . . to pass away unimproved,” he wrote about a possible sojourn at Canton: “He desires to know in what part of the Province of Yuh your excellency proposes that he shall temporarily reside, in case he should find that the time of delay will prove to be sufficiently brief to enable him to await an interview with an Imperial Commissioner before proceeding to the North.” See *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 10. Similarly, Cushing's demands appeared to Ching to be somewhat multifarious and bombastic. See footnote 24.

<sup>26</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 7.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.

<sup>29</sup> The edict in part reads: “As the barbarian's vessel may easily sail by the favorable monsoon, it cannot be said for certain that it will not come to Tientsin. It is hereby



the delegation of power to Kiying to manage the affair in Canton was definitely suggested. But until Kiying's arrival it remained the duty of Ching to induce Cushing to stay at Macao.<sup>30</sup>

Unfortunately, the policy of Ching made Cushing impatient of waiting, and the envoy resorted to threats. On April 13, he sent the "Brandywine" to Whampoa, and Commodore Foxhall A. Parker proposed an exchange of salutes.<sup>31</sup> These proceedings caused terror among the Chinese; on April 17 an aide de camp of Ching went to Dr. Peter Parker, explaining "the alarm the firing of a salute would produce among the populace."<sup>32</sup> Three days afterward, the acting viceroy himself addressed Cushing: "This is against the regulations of the country."<sup>33</sup> What is more interesting to note is the fact that, simultaneous with these events, there was a renewed request, now

---

ordered that Narhkinga should notify the brigade-general of Tientsin to make preparations beforehand. In case the barbarian vessel come to Tientsin, the latter should immediately report it to the said viceroy [Narhkinga], while at the same time he should order the said barbarians to wait for the arrival of the viceroy to decide about what they want. As the said nation requests to send its embassy to the court, it is most important that we should not fight with them. If they desire provisions or water, permit them to purchase it. But none of them should be suffered to land. As to their request to negotiate regulations, the said viceroy, on arriving in Tientsin, should inform them that Kiying is the original negotiator and that he has now been appointed the viceroy of the two Kwangs and should arrive at Canton shortly. The trade regulations for the said nation had already been fixed. They should be ordered to return to Kwangtung immediately; this is not a place for a second negotiation of the regulations. With regard to their request to repair to the court in Peking, [the viceroy] should make known to them that in controlling barbarian peoples the Celestial Empire always follows old rules and that he has no power to make any intercession for them. He should explain to them kindly and refuse their requests by just reasoning. Let there be no ambiguity in the disposal of the matter." Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 71, pp. 14-15.

<sup>30</sup> In a letter from Dr. Parker to Cushing dated Canton, April 12, 1844, it was represented that Ching had sent an officer to Parker telling him that Kiying was coming "fast." Dr. Parker, with characteristic astuteness, "reiterated *emphatically* that Y. E. [Cushing] must absolutely go to Peking, & that you cannot suffer the favorable monsoon to pass unimproved." In that case, the officer promised promptly, the envoy could go by land. It becomes apparent that Ching was then expecting the early arrival of Kiying while in the meantime he labored to detain Cushing at Macao. See Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 428-29.

<sup>31</sup> The purpose of this act was given by Cushing as "a visit, for a few days, of courtesy and civility to the capital of the Province." See *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 11.

<sup>32</sup> Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 430.

<sup>33</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 16.

almost challenging in tone, for permission to go to Peking. On April 15, Dr. Parker advised Cushing not to be afraid to insist on proceeding to the North, for "the *right* of the case," as he put it, was on the side of the envoy.<sup>34</sup> This letter was responsible for Cushing's dispatch to Ching on the next day, in which, after explaining his intention to leave for Peking immediately, the envoy stated that perhaps "it would be necessary for my Government, in the first instance, to subject the people of China to all the calamities of war. . . ." <sup>35</sup> Dr. Parker again wrote Cushing: "I think that a fair, upright, fearless, judicious policy is the true one with such a pusillanimous & haughty government."<sup>36</sup> In spite of these proceedings on the part of Cushing and Parker, the acting viceroy answered that the envoy's request should be judged strictly according to law, although he was "not ignorant that your excellency, having arrived in the Province of Canton [*sic*], is unwilling to be long detained."<sup>37</sup>

The transactions between Cushing and Ching might have led to a complete rupture<sup>38</sup> but for the arrival of news that Kiyung was coming to Canton with full power to negotiate with the American envoy.<sup>39</sup> In a communication from Ching to Cushing, dated May 8, the former wrote that he had received notification from the privy council that Kiyung had been appointed viceroy of the two Kwangs and given the seal of imperial commissioner "in order that with the honorable Plenipotentiary he may negotiate and settle deliberations."<sup>40</sup> On May 24, Cushing received a letter from Kiyung himself, announcing his impending arrival and his wish to meet the envoy soon.<sup>41</sup>

While the pleasant news of the coming of Kiyung thus reached Cushing, the envoy kept making complaints<sup>42</sup> and dwelling on the request of going to Peking. That Cushing's policy was to

<sup>34</sup> Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 429.

<sup>35</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 13.

<sup>36</sup> Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 430-31.

<sup>37</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 14, 20.

<sup>38</sup> For the bad feeling between Cushing and Ching, *ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>39</sup> On board ship at Suchau, April, 29, 1844, Kiyung wrote Cushing that he was "travelling full speed, and may arrive in a very short time." *Ibid.*, p. 35.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 25-27.

persist purposely in the request, while in truth he was willing to await the coming of Kiyung, seems beyond doubt; for he wrote to the secretary of state, A. P. Upshur, on May 27:

I have replied to this letter [Ching's letter of May 9], expressing my satisfaction in the prospect of meeting a Commissioner so competent and so well disposed as Tsiyeng, but signifying, also, that I do not relinquish the purpose of ultimately repairing to Peking.

He further betrayed his motives when he, in the same dispatch, went on to say that "nothing could be more advantageous than to negotiate with Tsiyeng at Canton" and that

without any steamer, and without even the "St. Louis" and the "Perry," it would be idle to repair to the neighborhood of the Pih-ho, in any expectation of acting upon the Chinese by intimidation, and obtaining from their fears concessions contrary to the feeling and settled wishes of the imperial government.<sup>43</sup>

Kiyung arrived in Canton on May 31.<sup>44</sup> On June 3 Cushing received a letter from him announcing his arrival and his intention of repairing promptly to Macao to meet the envoy.<sup>45</sup> He left Canton on June 10 and reached Macao on the 16th.<sup>46</sup> The next day he took lodgings at a temple in a village called Wanghia.<sup>47</sup> Among his advisers and assistants were Hwang Gan Tung, Chow Hsüan Tao, and Pwan Shih Chen. On June 18 Kiyung was received by Cushing at the Legation House at Macao, and on the 19th the visit was returned.<sup>48</sup>

Pending the opening of the negotiation after this exchange of ceremonies, an episode occurred which, while independent and isolated in origin, was to be closely involved in the subsequent transactions. In the evening of June 15, a number of lawless natives of Canton broke into the English garden in which some

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32. Later, on June 6, the "St. Louis" and the "Perry" arrived at Macao, and Cushing wrote Upshur: "The arrival of these vessels relieves me from a load of solicitude in regard to the public business; for if matters do not go smoothly with Tsiyeng, the legation has now the means of proceeding to and acting at the North." *Ibid.*, pp. 33-34.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-36.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 33, 38.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38. The name of the village is also spelled as "Wang Hiya," "Wang Shia," "Wang Heah," "Wang Ha," "Wang Ya," or "Mong Ha."

<sup>48</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 38-39. *Chinese repository*, XIII (1844), 335.

Englishmen were walking. A similar event happened the next day in the American garden. When the mob was turned out, they threw brickbats, and in the midst of the fight one American killed a native called Hsü A-man.<sup>49</sup> During the several days following, the Chinese authorities and the Chinese public made a number of communications and proclamations but left the matter unsettled.<sup>50</sup>

When Cushing paid his visit to Kiyong on June 19, it was decided that Messrs. Hwang, Chow, and Pwan, representing Kiyong, would make preparations for the negotiation with the representatives of Cushing, Messrs. Webster, Bridgman, and Parker, that same evening. Kiyong did not question the expediency or necessity of negotiating a treaty;<sup>51</sup> on the contrary, he proceeded "at once to the discussion of the articles of a treaty between China and the United States."<sup>52</sup> Cushing was asked to prepare a *projet* or draft treaty, which he presented on June 21.<sup>53</sup> That Kiyong should be so accommodating was mainly due to his eagerness to prevent Cushing from going to Peking.<sup>54</sup> It is open to question whether the negotiation would not have been carried to a conclusion even more speedily but for the intervention of the Hsü A-man case. On June 22, Kiyong requested Cushing to examine the case.<sup>55</sup> On the same date Cushing sent two communications—one to Kiyong and the other to P. S. Forbes, American consul at Canton. In the former the envoy represented that the Chinese vagabonds compelled the Americans to have recourse to firearms in defense of their lives.<sup>56</sup> In

<sup>49</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 63. "Hsü A-man" is also spelled as "Sue Aman."

<sup>50</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 65, 67-69.

<sup>51</sup> Cushing later wrote John Nelson: "Tsiyeng abandons the view of the subject . . . as to the question whether China shall conclude a treaty with the United States." *Ibid.*, p. 40.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

<sup>54</sup> In his dispatch to Cushing dated June 22, 1844, Kiyong wrote: "Now, we two men having met face to face, we are both of the same heart. Moreover, the articles of a treaty have already been projected, and in a little time we can settle them, and deliberate upon the exchange of treaties. . . . It is correct, then . . . to say, that it is needless to proceed [to court]." *Ibid.*, p. 43.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

the latter he formulated for the first time his famous theory of "extraterritoriality"—the doctrine of the exemption of aliens in China from the jurisdiction of the Chinese authorities. Applying the general principle to the Hsü A-man affair, he wrote Forbes:

Accordingly, I shall refuse at once all applications for the surrender of the party who killed Sue Aman; which refusal involves the duty of instituting an examination of the facts by the agency of officers of the United States.<sup>67</sup>

Cushing's determination thus emphatically stated was, however, communicated to Kiyong on June 24 in a euphemistic fashion: "I assure your excellency that I deeply regret what has occurred. I have caused to be instituted a careful inquiry into all the facts of the case."<sup>68</sup> But whatever the import of Cushing's disposal of the matter, Kiyong paid little heed to it. In an interview between the imperial commissioner and the American envoy at the Legation House on June 24, Kiyong laid great emphasis on Cushing's proposed journey to Peking. The situation was well described by Cushing: "If I persisted in the purpose of going there [Peking] at this time, he had no power to continue the negotiation of the treaty."<sup>69</sup> The imperial commissioner focused his attention on the one point which he deemed preponderantly important. In his memorial which described the interview, he stood out in bold relief as attaching little importance to the negotiation of commercial regulations, while directing his chief attention to the proposed journey to Peking.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>60</sup> Portions of this memorial, which was received in Peking on July 17, 1844, read: "I, your slave, had during the last several days successively sent my delegate Hwang Gan Tung, together with other officers, to explain clearly to him [Cushing], to commend him for having waited in Kwangtung peacefully, and also to tell him that even if he proceeds to Peking, he will be ordered to turn back, thus making a futile journey. . . . But his words in regard to the abandonment of his project to go north are very vague. He only urges that trade articles be quickly agreed to, copies of them made and signed, and that they be kept by both parties. Considering that the said barbarian envoy has come here after a long voyage, I, your slave, consider it quite right to effect a speedy negotiation of the treaty, provided that he does not make any unreasonable demands besides what is contained in the General Regulations. But upon examining the first communication from the said barbarian envoy to the exacting viceroy Ching Yuhsai which the latter had transmitted to me, I find that it appears to be his intention to con-

Meantime, the *projet* presented by Cushing on June 21 had been under consideration for several days by the delegates of both negotiators. The draft contained forty-seven stipulations, of which, according to Kiyung, many were impracticable and absurd.<sup>61</sup> The latter wrote:

We discriminated among the stipulations which should be allowed, changed, abrogated, or added. . . . When we came upon those which are according to reason, we pointed out the rational elements to him, in order to break up his ignorance. As to those which would affect the institutions of the Empire, we argued strongly against him, in order to terminate his vain expectations. Moreover, wherever the expressions are obscure, we cannot but modify it to make it clear and certain.<sup>62</sup>

clude a treaty first, and then, to proceed to Peking. He is urging at present an early signature of the treaty. But I am afraid that after the signature of the treaty, he will still sail to the north; and that if due preparation is not made against the plan, I shall be lost in his pitfall. . . .

"I, your slave, find that the said barbarian envoy Cushing, in making the stipulations in the draft treaty, intends to secure trade with China on the same terms as were provided in the General Regulations for the English barbarians. As he learns that the English barbarians have concluded a definite treaty, he therefore follows their example. This is yet conformable to reason. But his request to go to Peking is really with a view to surpass the English barbarians. And, further, he frequently refers to the intended journey in threatening language. Now I have led Hwang Gan Tung and other officers to enlighten his mind. On the tenth day [June 25, 1844] the said barbarian envoy told Hwang Gan Tung and others that having deliberated for several days upon what the imperial commissioner had said, he finds that it is very clear, and that he will stay temporarily at Macao and refrain from proceeding to the north. Although this was said in person, yet it is hard to trust it. When I shall receive the reply of the said barbarian envoy, I shall submit to Your Majesty a speedy memorial reporting the true sentiment and expression thereof." Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 72, pp. 1-2.

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 62. Also, on June 29, Kiyung wrote Cushing that some articles still needed careful deliberation. See *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 51-52.

<sup>62</sup> This quotation appears in a memorial from Kiyung to the emperor, received in Peking on July 28, 1844, which is translated in the following: "The draft treaty originally presented by the said barbarian envoy contains forty-seven articles. Among them, there are impracticable ones arbitrarily asked for by the envoy. There are also very important ones which demand promulgation, but have been left out by him. Further, its meaning is crude and foolish and its phrases very obscure. There are in it many false points; it is hard to enumerate them.

"I, Kiyung, your slave, leading my adviser, Hwang Gan Tung, and other officers, went back and forth to argue and discuss with him successively for many days. We discriminated among the stipulations which should be allowed, changed, abrogated, or added. Finally, we agreed to thirty-four articles. When we came upon those which are

But, although Kiying and his officers thus manifested much discrimination in deliberating upon the proposals of Cushing, yet their chief interests did not lie in considering the details of

according to reason, we pointed out the rational elements to him, in order to break down his ignorance. As to those which would affect the institutions of the empire, we argued strongly against him, in order to terminate his vain expectations. Moreover, wherever the expressions are obscure, we cannot but modify it to make it clear and certain. We totally changed the draft four times before the treaty was finally concluded.

"In the draft treaty originally presented by the said barbarian envoy, there are ten articles which are absolutely impossible for our government to allow but which are insistently asked for. As for instance, when the [barbarian] consuls at various ports have any business to transact, it is natural that they should first communicate with the viceroy or the lieutenant governor. But the said barbarian envoy asks permission for these consuls to be allowed to address communications directly to the court of censors in Peking. When it happens that foreign buildings are burned by accident, it is natural that they should be repaired by the merchant owners themselves. But the said barbarian, alleging the precedent of indemnification by the Hongs, vainly hopes that such accidents shall also be indemnified by our government. When foreign goods have been imported and duties paid thereon, it is no concern of our government whether their sales be good or bad. But the said barbarian envoy requests that the duties be returned if the goods are not sold after three years. Once the Hong merchants have been abolished, it is natural that the barbarian merchants should find their own way to transact business with the Chinese merchants. But the said barbarian envoy demands that the Chinese government build warehouses and keep goods in these warehouses for them. Merchant vessels are allowed only to trade at the five ports, and not to sail elsewhere; yet the said barbarian suggests that commercial intercourse should be completely free between nations. Merchant vessels anchoring at a port should be controlled by the consul; but the said barbarian envoy requests that the Chinese government should assume the responsibility of controlling and protecting them and that in case injuries should be caused to them by other powers, the Chinese government should compensate for them. When foreign powers are at war, it is none of China's concern to restrain them. But the barbarian envoy suggests that should the vessels [of the United States] be seized by their enemies, the Chinese government shall help attack the latter. Foreign warships should anchor outside a port; yet the said barbarian envoy suggests that once a man-of-war arrives at a harbor, both the vessel and the fort shall exchange salutes of guns in order to enhance mutual good will and respect. It is natural that the messages from foreign nations should be presented to the viceroys or lieutenant governors of coastal provinces who would deal with them severally. But the said barbarian envoy requests that either the *Nuy Ko* [the imperial cabinet] or other boards or yamen shall receive the messages from his own country. The primary objects of treaties are amity and prevention of troubles. But the said barbarian envoy mentions that when the two nations shall be at war, the [barbarian] merchants shall be allowed to withdraw and thus avoid disasters.

"All these stipulations are either impracticable or highly defective. Besides, there are many more which are minute, ambiguous, rapacious, and crafty. I, your slave, together with Hwang Gan Tung and other officers, corrected them one by one, without daring to yield the slightest ground. Repeated arguings and discussions took place: in

the provisions. Faithful to the policy of the government, Kiyong directed his attention almost exclusively to Cushing's projected journey to Peking. He regarded it as his chief duty to prevent

---

some cases, one article was discussed more than ten times over; in others, five or six times over. Not until it became quite obvious that the said barbarian envoy was fundamentally unsound in his position and that his arguments were exhausted, that he consented to cancel those arbitrary stipulations.

"As to the various articles in the treaty now agreed to, about eight-tenths are congruent with the supplementary treaty concluded [with England] last year. The article providing that the merchandise imported at one port with duties paid may be re-exported to another port without being subject to the payment of any additional duty; another providing that any vessel which, arriving at a port but having not yet broken bulk, wishes to depart, may do so within two days without being subject to the payment of any duty; and still another providing that any vessel having discharged its cargo at one port and paid duties thereon, and wishing to reship the discharged cargo to another port, may be exempted from paying additional duties—these are indeed at variance with the supplementary treaty of last year. But since five ports have now been opened to trade, the present-day situation is certainly different from one when Canton was the only port for foreign trade. It is only natural that those barbarian merchants, finding the market at one port not satisfactory, will seek to transship their merchandise to another. It seems improper to impose any arbitrary restraint on them, or to exact duties over again after they have been duly paid. It is wise, therefore, to exercise a certain moderation to accommodate the sentiment of the merchants, while in the meantime to maintain a searching examination in order to prevent corruptions.

"The articles providing that the citizens of the United States shall be allowed to lease sites at the ports to build churches and cemeteries and that they shall also be allowed to employ Chinese scholars to teach them the languages of the empire and assist them in literary labors and also to purchase all manner of books in China, I, your slave, at first refused to allow. But the said barbarian envoy replied that the Europeans at Macao and the British at Hongkong all enjoy the privileges of building churches and constructing cemeteries, thus affording the means for the living to pray for blessings and for the dead to find places of burial. He said that his countrymen trading in China are not great in number, and have never asked for any concession of lands. And, now, if they are again refused permission to lease lands for those purposes, they will certainly be lost in an abyss. As to the employment of Chinese teachers and the purchase of Chinese books, he said that these things have been done for a long time and that the demand for their promulgation in the treaty is designed only to prevent any possible quarrel arising therefrom among officers.

"Now, as I examine unto this matter, it seems to me that, since it is the barbarians who are to lease the sites and construct churches and cemeteries, it is idle to persist in refusing them. It is necessary, however, to publish a prohibitive law forbidding any compulsory leasing or arbitrary occupation and thus preventing the rise of any offensive feeling among the public. If our people are not willing to have their lands leased, those barbarians would have no pretext to put forth their demands.

"And, during these two hundred years since the foreigners began to come to trade at Canton, there have been a considerable number of people slightly versed in learning,



Cushing from going north. In considering the stipulations contained in the draft treaty proposed by Cushing, he ordered that considerable latitude should be given to those concerning trade.<sup>63</sup> But he laid great emphasis upon the delivery of the

like the interpreters or linguists, who serve as the means of communication and depend for their sustenance upon that employment. And also when the people of the Western nations record the events of a locality [in China], Chinese words are often used; even Chinese dictionaries and *yun-fu* [rhyming dictionaries] have been translated into the Western languages. These evidences show that the purchase of books must have happened quite often and it is long since impossible to search and prevent it. Therefore, it seems harmless to consent to what he requested.

"The articles bearing upon the mutual amity of the two nations and not concerned with trade are not contrary to our governmental policy. The one providing that the citizens of the United States who shall attempt to trade clandestinely with such of the ports of China as are not open to foreign commerce, or who shall trade in opium or any other contraband articles of merchandise, shall be subject to be dealt with by the Chinese government, has been added to the original draft. The fact that the said barbarian envoy consents to it amply shows that he is willing to observe the laws of the Celestial Empire, and will not act without restraint. The article suggested by him that the consuls of the United States at the five ports shall submit annually to the respective viceroys detailed reports of the number of vessels belonging to the United States which have entered and left the ports during the year, and of the amount and value of goods imported or exported in those vessels, for transmission to and inspection of the board of revenue, equally testifies to the willingness of the said barbarians to maintain a peaceful trade and prevent any fraud.

"Finally, the said barbarian envoy accepted completely the tariff agreed to last year except in regard to the duty on lead. He said that lead is the product of his country, and that to levy 4 mace on every 100 catties of it—three times what is levied on iron—seems to be too heavy a duty. At his request and considering that lead is not a chief staple and that the request is yet reasonable, I, Kiyung, your slave, accordingly reduced 1 mace and 2 candareens on every 100 catties, making it 2 mace and 8 candareens. The said barbarian envoy also obediently agreed to this." Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 72, pp. 15-18.

<sup>63</sup> This is amply shown in the following paragraphs taken from a memorial from Kiyung to the emperor, received in Peking on July 22, 1844: "Accordingly, during the last several days, I, together with Hwang Gan Tung and other officers, had treated with him, with repeated arguings and discussions. In regard to those stipulations which are concerned with trade, I ordered that they be made in conformity with the General Regulations of last year. As to those which are not concerned with trade, they are also to be allowed if there can be found similar provisions in the supplementary treaty of last year. Even if there are no precedents in the latter treaty, it is also permissible to allow what they request, provided that it is not difficult of execution and of no great concern. But if the stipulations are at great variance with the supplementary treaty, and contradict the existing institutions of the nation, they are to be strictly abrogated. The said barbarian envoy, although not without complaining and arguing, yet manifested considerable reason and obeyed in most cases.

"But there are yet four or five articles left undecided. Further, the said barbarian

letter from the American government which Cushing was carrying with him, for he deemed that, so long as it was not handed over, Cushing was not giving up his project of going to Peking, and that the negotiation could not come to a satisfactory end. In a memorial, received in Peking on July 22, Kiyong represented:

Now, as we were negotiating the treaty during the last several days successively, their ideas as to the disposal of the letter had been all along hidden and uncertain. It is not improbable that after the negotiation of the treaty is over, he will again request to proceed to Peking. If we deny his request at that time, he would allege as a pretext that he could not deliver the letter elsewhere but in Peking. It is therefore most important to prevent any such event.<sup>64</sup>

This was the great difficulty, so far as the Chinese were concerned, in the course of the negotiation. Kiyong also wrote: "I

envoy at first stated his intention of proceeding to Peking to deliver the letter of the president of his country. Now, although he has abandoned the project, yet he tells no truth about the delivery of the letter. The barbarian headmen, Webster and others, when meeting Hwang Gan Tung, had shown their expectation that a special officer be deputed by Your Majesty to proceed to Canton to receive the letter; but Hwang Gan Tung instantly denied the possibility of such a commission. Now, as we were negotiating the treaty during the last several days successively, their ideas as to the disposal of the letter had been all along hidden and uncertain. It is not improbable that after the negotiation of the treaty is over, he will again request permission to proceed to Peking. If we deny his request at that time, he will allege as a pretext that he can not deliver the letter elsewhere but in Peking. It is therefore most important to prevent any such event.

"The said barbarian envoy has also attempted to insert an article in the treaty now under negotiation providing that the supreme boards in Peking be appointed to receive

*[The emperor underscores the following sentences in vermilion.]*

the messages from his own country, as Russia and other nations had done before. The motive of this demand seemed most probably connected with his intention to proceed to

*[Comment by the emperor in vermilion: good]*

Peking after the negotiation. I, your slave, therefore persist in refusing the demand.

"But the said barbarian envoy continues to make the request without an end. And I consider again that since the aim of the American barbarians is trade, it is proper that a definite treaty should be negotiated with them. But the chief Cushing is a mighty cunning person; and caution on our part, however much, would not be superfluous. I am waiting until all matters shall be settled and until he shall not put forward the delivery of the letter of his government as the pretext for his going to the north, when I

*[Comment by the emperor in vermilion: good]*

shall promptly conclude the treaty with him. . . ." Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 72, pp. 5-7.

<sup>64</sup> See footnote 63.

deemed that so long as the letter was not delivered to us, the sentiment among the barbarians would always be in a state of agitation."<sup>65</sup>

It is most important to bear in mind Kiying's abhorrence of Cushing's intention to go to Peking, in studying the subsequent progress of the negotiation. For, although Cushing's instructions included the presenting of the letter of his government in Peking, it was by no means the most important condition. In fact, it was clearly stated in Webster's dispatch of May 8, 1843, that the "leading object" of the mission was to secure commercial privileges and that the envoy was to present the letter in Peking "if practicable."<sup>66</sup> Kiying, on the other hand, missed the

<sup>65</sup> This passage is taken from a memorial from Kiying to the emperor, received in Peking on July 27, 1844. The memorial, translated in the following, is Kiying's report of the conclusion of the Treaty of Wanghia.

" . . . I had examined the motive of the said barbarian envoy in insisting upon proceeding to Peking; it appears to be concerned mainly with the letter of his government rather than with the treaty. Evidence as to this was borne out in the very first communication of his to the lieutenant governor [then the acting viceroy of the two Kwangs] Ching, which had already been submitted to your imperial perusal by the said lieutenant governor. The original purpose of his coming to China seems to be that the treaty might be negotiated and concluded in frontier provinces, while the letter of his government must be presented in Peking by himself. Therefore, I deemed that so long as the letter was not delivered to us, the sentiment among the barbarians would always be in a state of agitation. In that case, we cannot be certain about his projected journey to the north, even if definite terms [prohibiting it] were promulgated in the treaty.

"Since the said barbarian envoy had now delivered to us the letter and requested us to present it for him, it became clear that he had abandoned the hope of proceeding to Peking. But, as the barbarian temperament is rough and fickle, the apprehension naturally arose in my mind lest changes should take place if things were not conducted in a speedy manner. I, your slave, therefore, ordered that copies be made of the negotiated treaty; that they be given to the said barbarian envoy to be translated, article by article, into barbarian characters; and that each examine unto the other so that there would be no error. Immediately afterward, a date was fixed for meeting the said barbarian envoy, upon which occasion the treaty was signed and sealed. He was entertained with a feast and impressed with favor and honesty, whereby he was greatly cheered. . . .

"After the meeting with the said barbarian envoy and the signing of the treaty were over, I left the spot, together with Hwang Gan Tung, the provincial treasurer, and other officers. On the 22nd day of the 5th month [July 7, 1844] I reached the provincial capital [Canton]." Translated from *Yi wu shih mo*, reign of Tao-kuang, Bk. 72, pp. 13-15.

<sup>66</sup> *S. Docs.*, 138, 23 Cong., 2 Sess., pp. 1-5. Mr. Tyler Dennett is right when he comments on this part of Cushing's instructions: "A secondary object, quite subordinate to the first [securing commercial privileges], was to reach the Emperor at Peking. The instructions to proceed to the capital of the empire were to be used as a lever for securing

whole point. His preoccupation with the policy of excluding foreign envoys from the court in Peking blinded him to the real, vital issues. As it happened, Kiyong strove hard to prevent Cushing from going to Peking, and was quite willing to give concessions on other points, provided that the supreme object he had in view could be satisfied.

It was, therefore, a difference between the negotiators in their respective purposes which facilitated the entire course of the negotiation. What Kiyong strove for was by no means the essential condition of Cushing's mission, while with the "leading object" of the latter Kiyong found no inconvenience in complying. In Kiyong's account of the negotiation of the treaty,<sup>67</sup> it is evident that he attached only a moderate importance to the concession of commercial privileges to the Americans and paid little heed to the question of extraterritoriality. In regard to the provisions concerning the exemption of the American goods from the payment of additional duties upon reshipment, he even went so far as to apologize to the emperor for Cushing.<sup>68</sup>

After the interview on June 24, Kiyong's policy became clear to Cushing—a policy indicating an unusual readiness to make treaty concessions on condition that the American envoy give up his intended journey north. This decided Cushing, on June 25, to abandon the project.<sup>69</sup> Once the supreme demand of the imperial commissioner was thus complied with, Cushing pressed other matters hard. On the very day when his decision to abandon his journey to Peking was made known, he endeavored to take advantage of the case of Hsü A-man by alluding to the murder of Sherry (May 22, 1841): "I am not aware that the persons who committed the wanton murder of Sherry . . . have

---

the primary object of the mission, rather than to be considered as constituting a primary purpose." *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

<sup>67</sup> See footnote 62.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 52. Cushing himself wrote that going to Peking "was but the means to an end,—that end being the establishment of the commercial interests of the United States in China on a satisfactory footing of advantage, confidence, friendship, and permanency. To attain this end was the indispensable object; the means were a matter of choice, according to circumstances." *Ibid.*, p. 59.

ever been punished. . . ."<sup>70</sup> He further alluded to the imprisonment and detention of the American consul, Snow, in March-May, 1839, by the imperial commissioner, Lin Tsê-hsü, in a challenging tone.<sup>71</sup> Then, on June 27, Cushing offered to discuss with the imperial commissioner the manner of delivering the letter of President Tyler, asking whether he was authorized to receive it.<sup>72</sup> Amidst these diplomatic maneuvers Kiying was well-nigh bewildered. He wished the Hsü A-man case to be settled to the satisfaction of the Chinese public;<sup>73</sup> he insisted that the American ministers should communicate with provincial governors in China when there was no minister appointed,<sup>74</sup> a proposal which Cushing opposed;<sup>75</sup> he replied to Cushing that he had no means of answering him regarding the case of Sherry;<sup>76</sup> and yielded ground when he answered Cushing's allusion to the detention of Snow.<sup>77</sup> But, in spite of everything else, Kiying was heartily pleased by Cushing's decision to abandon the journey to Peking,<sup>78</sup> and the promise to present President Tyler's letter to him.<sup>79</sup> In Kiying's eyes the great stumbling-block was now removed and the negotiation could come to a speedy conclusion.

With characteristic straightforwardness, Kiying ordered that the approved draft be duly signed. He memorialized the emperor:

Since the said barbarian envoy had now delivered to us the letter and requested us to present it for him, it became clear that he had abandoned the hope of proceeding to Peking. . . . I, your slave, therefore, ordered that copies be made of the negotiated treaty; that they be given to the said barbarian envoy to be translated, article by article, into barbarian characters; and that each examine unto the other so that there would be no error. Immediately afterward, a date was fixed for meeting the said barbarian envoy, upon which occasion the treaty was signed and sealed. He was entertained with a feast and impressed with favor and honesty, whereby he was greatly cheered.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49. For the facts of the Sherry affair, see *S. Docs.*, 130, 29 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 10-11, 13-14.

<sup>71</sup> *S. Docs.*, 67, 28 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 50.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 52-53.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 49.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56-57.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>80</sup> See footnote 65.

The signature of the Treaty of Wanghia took place on July 3—scarcely a fortnight after the negotiation was begun.<sup>81</sup> By this treaty Cushing won all that he could possibly desire.<sup>82</sup> The events that followed—the definition of the tariff, the settlement of the Hsu A-man case and of the Emery and Frazer affair, and the ratification of the treaty by both governments—need not detain us here. What is important to note is the speed and facility with which the negotiation was carried to a successful conclusion. But for the inexperience of the Chinese government, it is to be questioned whether Cushing could have achieved such a success for his country. In the words of the envoy himself is found the clue to a proper understanding of the history of the treaty:

The Chinese government treated with that of the United States unwillingly. . . . But when the Imperial Government had made up its mind to yield, it resolved to do so gracefully, and proceeded to act with characteristic straight-forwardness and frankness.<sup>83</sup>

PING CHIA KUO

YANGSHE, WUSIH, CHINA

<sup>81</sup> The actual negotiation of the treaty covered the thirteen days from June 21 to July 3, 1844.

<sup>82</sup> For the text of the Treaty of Wanghia, see *Treaties, conventions, etc., between China and foreign states* (2d ed.; Shanghai, 1917), I, 677-712.

<sup>83</sup> From a newspaper article prepared by Cushing in 1852. Quoted in Fuess, *op. cit.*, I, 441.

## DOCUMENTS

### LETTERS OF MAZZINI TO W. J. LINTON

**W**ILLIAM JAMES LINTON<sup>1</sup> was a friend and a zealous follower of Joseph Mazzini. Born in London in 1812, Linton was by trade a wood engraver, one of the best of his time; and his accomplishments in that field are probably most widely known. But he was a man of wide ability and interests, a prolific author, something of a poet, and, most important in the discussion of his relations with Mazzini, an enthusiastic supporter of all liberal or republican movements on the Continent and in England. Before he came into contact with Mazzini he was a member of the Chartist party, and throughout his life he devoted much of his time and money to the advancement of radical political schemes.<sup>2</sup> In fact, there were times when he rather neglected his work and the welfare of his family in his efforts for the liberal cause.

Mazzini had arrived in England, the haven for all political exiles at that time, early in 1837. Linton was introduced to him by Joseph Toynbee, probably in 1840. This casual acquaintanceship was greatly strengthened as a result of the famous

<sup>1</sup> There is no adequate biography of Linton. The best source is still his autobiographical *Memories* (London, 1895), a delightful rambling account.

<sup>2</sup> Linton edited several political journals and periodicals, none of them successful as business ventures. The most important of these was the *English Republic*, published from 1851 to 1855 in London and Brantwood. Mazzini contributed articles; and the paper had for its motto his "God and the People," and later his "The Formation of a Nation Is a Religion." In 1848 Linton had edited on the Isle of Man, which had the privilege of free postage, a weekly entitled the *Cause of the People*. In 1850 he was associated with T. L. Hunt and G. H. Lewes in the publication of the *Leader*, but he soon gave this up when Lewes and Hunt proved to be less extreme republicans than himself. Linton also contributed articles to such periodicals as the *Red Republican*, the *Nation*, and the *People's Journal*. Linton wrote several books that are of interest in showing his political views. *European republicans: recollections of Mazzini and his friends* (London, 1892) is a vigorous and frankly biased account. See also his *Life of Thomas Paine* (1840) and *James Watson, a memoir of Chartist times* (Hamden, Connecticut, 1879). Linton's *Memories* contains much that is of value in regard to his republican connections.

Post Office case of 1844, in the investigation of which Linton was one of Mazzini's most active partisans. Some unimportant letters from Linton to Mazzini had been among those opened by the authorities. The friendship formed at this time was to continue, with varying degrees of intimacy, until Mazzini's death in 1872.

The following letters from Mazzini to Linton, which are, with one exception,<sup>3</sup> in the possession of the Yale University Library, cover a period of approximately twenty years, from 1847 to 1867. They are for the most part undated, but it has been possible to place them with at least some degree of accuracy. The letters may be roughly divided into three groups. The first of these groups, centering around the events preliminary to the revolutionary movements of 1848, includes letters I-III. In letter III, apparently written in 1847, Mazzini discusses, apropos of Linton's censorship of one of his articles, his conception of Jesus and of Christianity. The second group, rather intermediary in nature, consists of letters IV-IX, scattered over the period from 1852 to the end of 1863. They deal with Mazzini's many attempts in these years to gain his revolutionary ends, especially in Milan, Venice, and Rome, and with the Polish revolution of 1863. The third and last group, perhaps the most connected and interesting of all, is made up of three letters on the occasion of Linton's visit to the United States in November, 1866. They are concerned mainly with Mazzini's proposed "Republican Alliance," an organization to be formed between the European and the American republicans. This Alliance was doomed to failure, as was true of so many of Mazzini's projects. Included in this group are Mazzini's instructions to Linton upon

<sup>3</sup> This is No. V, which was given to Professor George La Piana, of Harvard University, by Mrs. Margaret Linton Mather, one of Linton's daughters, and is still in his possession. Mr. La Piana published an Italian translation of this letter and three of the others—I, III, and VI—with an article "Alcune lettere inedite di G. Mazzini" in the *Azione* of Genoa on January 25-26, 1920. He printed the letters in English, with an article in Italian entitled "Giuseppe Mazzini e sue lettere inedite a W. J. Linton," in the *Apostolato*, a collection of articles published in Boston in 1922, on the fiftieth anniversary of Mazzini's death. Mr. La Piana has kindly given me permission to republish these four letters here. From the article in the *Azione* three of the letters—I, V, and VI—still in Italian translation, have found their way into the *Edizione nazionale degli scritti di Giuseppe Mazzini* (Imola, 1906—in process.).



his departure, with an interesting discussion showing his view of the general European situation, a letter of introduction for Linton to present to the chairman of the Republican Committee of New York, and a later letter of advice to Linton in America written in January, 1867. The correspondence may very well have ended here, as interest in other matters and the obvious hopelessness of the situation appears to have lessened Linton's enthusiasm for his task. Linton remained, however, a devoted believer in Mazzini and in Mazzini's ideals until his own death in 1897. Shortly before that time he wrote of Mazzini: "He stands, as I believe, the greatest man in this nineteenth century, none greater in the years of Time, the Prophet of the Future."<sup>4</sup>

The letters are all in Mazzini's hand, some evidently having been dashed off in great haste, with little attention to style or punctuation. The series, while not extremely important in itself, may be considered as worth while in giving a sidelight on Mazzini's relations with one of his followers over a long period of time.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

FREDERICK W. HOEING

I<sup>5</sup>

[PARIS, November 18, 1847]<sup>6</sup>

DEAR FRIEND—

The "Patrie" and the "Reforme" have already mentioned the meeting.<sup>7</sup> I see that it has been reported by the English papers, and this proves that we were right when urging for a meeting. I thank you for your time and speech. It will be published in our Italian papers and elsewhere. But, for God's sake, try to have the Report printed as quick as possible; and if you can send a few copies, or even proofsheets

<sup>4</sup> *Memories*, p. 152.

<sup>5</sup> All the letters, with the exception of No. XI, are from Mazzini to Linton.

<sup>6</sup> An Italian translation of this letter is included in the *Edizione nazionale* of Mazzini's works (Vol. XXXIII, No. MMCLXXI, pp. 107-8). It is dated merely as November, 1847, instead of the more exact date of November 18. A note adds that Linton's speech was printed in the *Alba* on December 11, 1847.

<sup>7</sup> The public meeting of the People's International League, held in London on November 15, 1847. Linton was the secretary of the League, which had been organized, under the guidance of Mazzini, in April of that year. Its purpose was to interest the British public in the national and political rights of the peoples on the Continent and, more especially, to gain sympathy for Italy.

before the 25th, do so. If nothing comes in the way, I will leave on the 27th. Ever yours in haste

18.

Jos.

## II

[LONDON, February 28, 1848]

DEAR LINTON

I have just now received a letter from Paris; and I think I must leave, if possible, to-morrow evening: there is I think a train from here to Folkestone at 8 o'clock. Can you come?<sup>8</sup> If they agree upon the League's address, they could send a word through the post next day, to tell you that it has been agreed upon; entrusting both you and me as delegates of the League. If you can come, that is if you have another address to present as a result of this evening's meeting, I will be glad Let me know.

Yours in haste

JOS. MAZZINI

## III

[1847]

MY DEAR FRIEND,

Thanks for the "Foi et Avenir." You shall have it back.

There was no money inside the parcel: not even the monthly part of the "People's Journal"<sup>9</sup> which I hoped to receive.

You will, you say, ask for the payment of *this* last article. Do you mean the *manuscript* one by *this*? If so, you will be pleased to remember Mr. Saunders, that he owes to me *two* articles and not one: none of "Democracy" has been paid to me. £2.15. are not, to be sure, the adequate payment for both. Look yourself to the number of the pages, and you will see. I have already paid Southern for both.

Now, as to the page. After a mature consideration, I think you are *wrong*: wrong in exercising a censorship, and having sent the page back when the rest was put in the hands of Saunders; for, unless you

<sup>8</sup> On February 29, 1848, Mazzini left London for Paris to be near the center of revolutionary activity. Linton and J. D. Collett accompanied him. They carried the first address of congratulation from the working men of London to the provisional government in Paris. The People's International League also sent a congratulatory address. This was the final action of the League, which then, with its task apparently completed, went out of existence.

<sup>9</sup> The *People's Journal* was a weekly paper founded by John Saunders in 1846. Mazzini's famous essay, "Thoughts upon democracy in Europe," which is mentioned in the foregoing letter, first appeared in the *People's Journal*, starting with the issue of August 1, 1846, and continuing at intervals into the year 1847.

have written a conclusion of your own, the article cannot stand thus mutilated: wrong, secondly, in the idea. You think of Jesus in a reactionary way, which would better belong to many of [the] ones who are persecuted with the fear of falling back to Christianity. I feel entirely calm in my appreciation of him, because I feel emancipated without the least fear of ever being a relapse. You seem to me to confound two things which are by no means to be confounded. I am not speaking of Jesus' *creed*: but, if I can express myself so, of his *method*: *faith* opposed to *calculation* and merely scientific researches. Whilst the savants were making books on eclectic mixing of all religious systems, he proceeded in an axiomatic way, starting *a priori* from a religious principle and a new one. He said: you are all equals, for you are all brothers in God; then he lived and died for his axiom; and therefore he implanted a religion and dominated, transforming it, the world during eighteen centuries, which no Neo-Platonic School, no "Panem et Circenses" would have done. He did certainly speak of heavenly reward; but are we not, when we speak of fulfilment of the Law, and of perfecting ourselves through a series of progressive existences, liable to the same reproach? Is not *that* a reward? It is not *there* that the evil lies, no more than in what I said about every great revolution producing as a distant but infallible result, an increase in material prosperity. It is in what you very properly state, that Jesus gives only the formula of the *individual* man and not of the *collective*; and it is in the theology or conception of Heaven of Christianity; but this has nothing to do with the concept I intend to state by way of an example between the religious *procédé* of Jesus and the materialistic one of the Roman utilitarians. Do not mistake Christianity. Christianity, as all religions in their turn, was a theory of *duty* too; but deficient in the idea of Progression, and contemplating the *individual* man, it had nothing to state except *duty* towards oneself, whilst we, knowing the *collective* man, are going to explain *duty* towards Humanity. Don't fear that I am misunderstood for a while by some of you; when I will come, after all the criticism, to state something of our own and will deduct all the series of our duties and hopes too from the idea of God, without uttering a single word about Jesus or Christianity, I will be understood.

Besides, and without wishing in the least to diplomatize, I want to re-link heaven and earth together, I want to teach my readers step by step to know that democracy instead of being an anti-religious thing, is starting from a religion and leading to another. There is more danger to us from Materialism than from Christian believers; and between the being, for a little while, mistaken by some for a Christian or by

others for a *denier* of all invisible things, I prefer to run the first chance.

After this, I really must, my dear Friend, claim my *rights* too. Let me go on, as intellect and heart suggest; even—which is far from being the case—even if I preached the Gospel, I ought to be allowed freedom of expression. Suppose Saunders would claim the power of cutting out all that is anti-utilitarian, what would I, between him and you be allowed?

I have cancelled a line, not because I retract it, but because it may, as you say, lead to more misinterpretation than I want. For all the rest, let me claim my rights. I *rely* upon your sending as soon as possible the rest to Saunders. You may say that the page had been missed; anything you like.

Nothing, till now, from George Sand.<sup>10</sup>

I will certainly see you before the 10th. I will then explain about the Swiss. I am more than ever overwhelmed with business; that is the only cause for my never calling on you.

Ever yours

JOS. MAZZINI

#### IV

[LONDON, December, 1852]

DEAR FRIEND

I did not send the petition before, because I was sure you had it next day of your note in the *Star of Freedom*: and because, in the *Record of the Friends of Italy*,<sup>11</sup> just out, there is an abstract of the petition to be copied and signed. Why did you say that you doubted my wishing to avail myself of your help? Spite of the little discrepancies between us on the Sh[illing] Subscrip. affair,<sup>12</sup> I am the same to-

<sup>10</sup> Mazzini contributed an article entitled "George Sand" to the April, 1847, number of the *People's Journal*. The mention of the "Democracy," of George Sand, and of the Swiss, probably dates this letter some time in the year 1847.

<sup>11</sup> The Society of the Friends of Italy was founded by Mazzini in 1851. It was composed largely of former members of the People's International League and was to continue the work of that organization. On November 10, 1852, the Society adopted a petition, mentioned above, to be presented to the house of commons, protesting against the continued occupation of Rome by the French and Austrian troops. An Italian translation of this petition is included in the *Edizione nazionale* (XLVI, 292-300), entitled "Petizione della Società degli Amici d'Italia contro l'occupazione francese e austriaca negli stati Romani." With it is the letter of Mazzini to the editor of the *Star of Freedom*, dated London, November 23, 1852, requesting the publication of the petition.

<sup>12</sup> The "Sh. Subscrip." was an attempt to gain funds for Italy begun by Mazzini in 1852 and called a "Shilling Subscription for European Freedom."

wards you, as I trust you are the same towards me. And, if either through the petition or the Sh. Subscrip. you can do something quickly for me, this is the time. Do not mind the appearances: the crisis is coming on very fast. How does the Sh. Subscription go with you?

Ever yours

Tuesday.

JOS. MAZZINI

V

[LONDON, June, 1853]<sup>13</sup>

DEAR FRIEND,

One word, but from the heart. Here I am safe, tired, but not disheartened. Nothing is changed in Italy; you must not mistake the results of the attempt.<sup>14</sup> It has revived the hopes and the determination of our Party. But of that we shall have time to speak. I have received your note, and only yesterday the Journal from Saffi.<sup>15</sup> I shall tell you what I think of them. I have published two pamphlets in Italian, but I have not a single copy as yet. Ever yours affectionately

Friday night.

JOS. MAZZINI

VI

[LONDON, June or July, 1855]<sup>16</sup>

DEAR FRIEND,

I send the receipts signed.

I shall call, perhaps on Friday; during the day, as I said. If so, or on Saturday, I shall write the day before. I would have called before; but the difficulty lies partly in my being very busy, partly in my not wanting to be *seen*. Two excepted, none of my countrymen or other exiles know where I am now living, whether in town or country etc. I am sick of everything except of work towards action. Through my state of mind, and plenty of other causes, I cannot afford to be now in contact except with the very very few chosen. And I can hardly go through London without meeting with Italians or others perfectly

<sup>13</sup> An Italian translation of this letter is included in the *Edizione nazionale* (Vol. XLIX, No. MMMDCVI, p. 227). It is dated June, 1853, with the comment that Mazzini returned to London on May 26, 1853.

<sup>14</sup> The disastrous rising in Milan of February 6, 1853.

<sup>15</sup> Aurelio Saffi, one of Mazzini's fellow-triumvirs in the Roman Republic of 1849. He had also been involved in this latest attempt.

<sup>16</sup> There is an Italian translation of this letter in the *Edizione nazionale* (Vol. L, No. MMMDCCLXXIX, p. 210). It is there dated in 1853. However, from the postmark on the envelope, it is clear that either June or July, 1855, is the correct date.

capable of following me and discovering my place of voluntary "reclusion."

Ever yours aff.ly

Tuesday.

JOSEPH MAZZINI

[Postmark on envelope: Ju. 55]

W. J. Linton Esq.

6 Lower Calthorpe Street, Gray's Inn Road.

VII

[LONDON, December 22, 1862]

MY DEAR LINTON,

I am sorry I was out yesterday. I feel repentant about my having done nothing for Rome. I send a list of official quotations which may be of use. The book on "Foreign Policy" where I think the declaration of your ministry that they had a solemn promise of withdrawal—in a debate of 1860 I think—is from Louis, of the Temple. Ask for it. It is important to have that declaration quoted. I shall send some few notes the day after to-morrow. I have had and have so much to do that time failed and fails now.

Ruffini<sup>17</sup> went to Mr. Stevens.<sup>18</sup> He was extremely well received, but nothing came out of it. He said that he would think of him *after the monument*.

Ever yours in haste

Monday.

JOS. MAZZINI

[Postmark on envelope: London S.W. DE22 62]

W. J. Linton Esq.

27 Leinster Square, Bayswater W.

VIII

[LONDON, February or March, 1863]

DEAR FRIEND,

I shall try what I can. Carlyle<sup>19</sup> is out of question. Masson<sup>20</sup> is carefully shunning every political question. But why instead of forming a

<sup>17</sup> Giovanni Ruffini was one of Mazzini's early followers in the organization of "Young Italy," and accompanied Mazzini to England in 1837.

<sup>18</sup> Alfred Stevens, the British sculptor, had studied in Italy and was much interested in the Italian cause. The monument referred to by Mazzini was the Wellington monument for St. Paul's Cathedral, which Stevens had undertaken in 1856 and which occupied most of his time in the following years.

<sup>19</sup> Thomas Carlyle, the historian, was a friend of Mazzini, but a decided opponent of his political views.

<sup>20</sup> Professor David Masson, a Scottish author and scholar, had been the first secretary, from 1851 to 1852, of the Friends of Italy. But in 1852 he had been appointed professor of English literature at University College, London, and had apparently become more conservative.

new Committee—beginning again all the work—did you not propose to widen the Committee and Council of the “Friends of Italy” into one of “Friends of Italy and Poland”?<sup>21</sup> You might thus have yet all the names. Then, it would have been far better in other senses. Can it be done on Friday?

Ever yours  
JOS. MAZZINI

## IX

[LONDON, December 30, 1863]

DEAR LINTON,

Will you listen to Major Wolff<sup>22</sup> and help the scheme as far as in your power? It is for the Venetian affair, which you guessed from the Press to be my scheme. Ever aff.ly yours

JOSEPH

I know your loss<sup>23</sup> and deeply regret it.  
Dec. 30/63.<sup>24</sup>

## X

[LONDON, November, 1866]

Notes for you.

At the beginning of the year, I proposed an organized Alliance<sup>25</sup> between the European and the American Republicans. My address was answered, rather cautiously by the New York Committee, very warmly

<sup>21</sup> A Society of the Friends of Poland was organized in London at the outbreak of the Polish revolution, early in 1863. Linton was the secretary of the Central Committee of the Friends of Poland. There were at least two obvious reasons for the desire of Mazzini to unite the societies of Poland and Italy. Such a union would be a step toward the realization of his greater aim of a general European republic; and, if the movement in Poland were successful, it would probably lead to increased sympathy and aid for the allied republican cause in Italy.

<sup>22</sup> For years one of Mazzini's most trusted agents. Apparently he was an Austrian spy, who also gave regular reports on Mazzini to the French police; but Mazzini would never believe a word against him. See E. F. Richards, *Mazzini's letters to an English family* (London, 1920-22), III, 76-78.

<sup>23</sup> The “loss” mentioned by Mazzini is the death of Linton's favorite son, Lancelot, which occurred in the winter of 1863.

<sup>24</sup> The “63” is added in pencil and is apparently not in Mazzini's hand.

<sup>25</sup> See Mazzini's article on “The Republican Alliance” in the *Atlantic monthly*, (XIX [1867], 235-45), with a bitter attack on the Italian monarchy, based especially on the conduct and the results of the late Austro-Prussian war.

by the Boston one. The bearer of my proposals was Bulewski.<sup>26</sup> He came back with plenty of encouragements and written promises.

I was asked to propose the first steps. I did so. I proposed that Committees and Sub-committees of the *Alliance* should be organized everywhere through the States;—that tickets of admission, Subscription notes,<sup>27</sup> should be published worth one, five, ten, twenty dollars, and that each member should choose one as a document of his belonging to the Alliance—that a certain part of the result should come to us for the purpose of promoting morally and materially our republican aim, and a certain part remain in the U. S. for the purpose of spreading the principles of the Republican Alliance—that the notes of which I sent a sample should have at the top “Universal Republican Alliance, [”] symbols representing America and Europe, and three signatures for the alliance: Ledru Rollin’s, my own and an American—that from the U. S. there should come to us pamphlets, articles, tracts putting the American questions in the proper light to be published or re-published by us; and that we should send pamphlets, articles, documents on our own questions to be translated and published in America—and so on.

To these proposals I have never had any answer. They promised again, explained the delay as coming from the absorbing internal question, etc. but the delay has been prolonging itself to the actual day.

Your object must therefore be to urge them to realize the scheme practically or to ascertain that nothing can be done.

You will urge them, describing the actual moment as the one to be chosen—the moral fall of L.[ouis] N.[apoleon] in France, the prestige gone, the failures in Mexico, in Prussia, in England about the Congress, in Italy and everywhere having acted on [the] French mind—the illness, the possible sudden death and the intentions of the republicans—the Eastern question afloat—the increase, especially since the late war, of the Republican Party in Italy, the possibility of a rising, the Roman question opening in December next, the only objection in Italy to a change being the fear of monarchical Europe being against,

<sup>26</sup> Louis Bulewski, a young Polish liberal, reached America early in 1866 as the representative of the Central European Revolutionary Committee. He seems to have made a good impression on the republican sympathizers in the United States and to have started the organization of Mazzini’s Republican Alliance.

<sup>27</sup> Some of these subscription notes are included in the Linton material. They are signed by Mazzini for the European Republican Committee, with his mottoes “Thought and Action” and “God and Liberty” and with the rather pathetic statement, “Redeemable by the First Republic established in Europe after the Issue.”



the importance therefore of a material help and of any moral sympathy manifested from the U. S. to us—the possibility of yielding to the U. S. some naval station if wanted on the Dalmatian shore in the Adriatic, or of commercial compacts.

The language of the Press exhorting us to a Republic—a certain number of revolving rifles—a contact between me and the diplomatic agents of the U. S. in Italy—means of corresponding safely through them in Rome—money for both Italy and the French working-men-associations—these and other things would be of importance to us.

You must advert to the position of Spain where the régime is now such as to make a revolution not only possible but probable. And advert to the importance of the religious question to be solved in Rome.

Stansbury<sup>28</sup> and Claffin<sup>29</sup> are the Presidents of the N. Y. and Boston Committees. Should you, by chance, not find them, Col. Rush C. Hawkins,<sup>30</sup> Bible House, N. Y. and Judge Thomas Russell,<sup>31</sup> 35 Court Street, Boston, are the Secretaries. The letters may be delivered to them.

Stearns<sup>32</sup> is a fervent old Abolitionist, one of the best friends we have there. Mrs. Stearns, an exceptionally good woman was a personal friend of John Brown.

Gerrit [Smith]<sup>33</sup> is a very rich old man, a warm friend and perfectly understanding the necessity of America giving us material help—money. He is very influential.

<sup>28</sup> See letter XI of this article.

<sup>29</sup> Probably William Claffin (1818–1905), abolitionist and prohibitionist; member of the Massachusetts senate, 1859–61; governor of Massachusetts, 1869–71.

<sup>30</sup> Rush Christopher Hawkins (1831–1920) served in the Civil War on the side of the North; lawyer, book collector, authority on wood engraving, much interested in political reform.

<sup>31</sup> Thomas Russell (1825–87), American orator and judge, was at one time collector of the port of Boston.

<sup>32</sup> George Luther Stearns (1809–67) was a Boston merchant, a liberal, and a former friend and supporter of John Brown. He died, however, on April 9, 1867, soon after Linton's arrival in America.

<sup>33</sup> Gerrit Smith (1794–1874), a reformer and philanthropist. He had been an active abolitionist before the war, running for the governorship of New York and for the presidency of the United States on anti-slavery tickets, and was interested in all liberal political movements. In this connection see the article "Letters concerning the 'Universal Republic'" by W. F. Galpin in *American historical review*, XXXIV (1929), 779–86. These selections from the Gerrit Smith papers, now in the Syracuse University Library, include several letters that passed between Mazzini and Smith in 1866 and 1867 discussing Bulewski's visit to America and the prospect of a "Republican Alliance."

Cluseret<sup>34</sup> is a French brilliant officer, now a U. S. citizen and General: active, bold, brave, well acquainted with all the elements in the U. S. influential with some of them, but rather inclined to go from scheme to scheme and to lack persistence.

JOS. MAZZINI

Try to ascertain the true state of things in the U. S. and the probable result of the struggle between the President and Congress.

## XI

[LONDON, November 9, 1866]<sup>35</sup>

MY DEAR SIR,

Allow me to introduce to you, and through you to our friends, Mr. Linton, an English friend of mine. Mr. Linton is a distinguished Artist and a man of literary accomplishments: above all, a fervent patriot, belonging to our republican faith and therefore devoted to the cause of universal Liberty and Progression. He will speak to you about our actual tendencies, prospects, and wishes.

We very much regret your prolonged silence. The thought of the *Alliance* and the proposals contained in my last letter to both your Committee and that of Boston were, I think, deserving better fates. And looking to the promises of your Address and to the names appended to it, I feel almost a right to hope that some real practical results must still follow. I do not forget the difficulties of your position nor the lamentable internal struggle which absorbs your activity; but I still believe that to widen, by the organization of the Alliance, the

---

Mazzini's letter of introduction to Smith is also printed, as well as two letters from Linton to Smith trying to arrange for an interview. Linton apparently never succeeded in seeing Smith; the letter of introduction was forwarded to him at his home in Peterboro, New York. However, Smith did contribute five hundred dollars to Mazzini's cause.

<sup>34</sup> Gustave Paul Cluseret (1823-1900) was an adventurer and a soldier of fortune. He had served in the army of the Second French Republic in 1848, and had been in Garibaldi's volunteers in 1860. In the next year he had come to America to fight on the side of the Union in the Civil War. He had probably left the United States by the time of Linton's arrival, since he took part in the Fenian insurrection in Ireland in 1866-67.

<sup>35</sup> This letter of introduction to E. A. Stansbury, the chairman of the New York Republican Committee, was apparently never presented to Mr. Stansbury by Linton. Linton spent most of his time on his initial visit to America in New York City; so it is difficult to explain why this letter was never used. All through this period Linton seems to have been rather half-hearted in carrying out Mazzini's instructions; perhaps so many years of failure had at last discouraged him.

basis of the principle you represent would be beneficial both to America and Europe. And this seems to me to be the most favourable moment for it.

Hoping to hear soon from you, I am, dear Sir,

ever faithfully yours

Nov. 9,  
18 Fullham Road. S. W., London

JOSEPH MAZZINI

[Envelope:]

E. A. Stansbury, Esq.  
108 Broadway, Metropolitan Insurance, New York

## XII

[LONDON, January 22, 1867]

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I could not answer before yours of the 6th December. It is very satisfactory and I am very grateful to you for the activity you have displayed, and hopeful that it will be crowned by success.

I send the power. I think that the form, although confidential, will answer the purpose.

You seem to have got to work completely *en dehors* of the Committees of N. Y. and Boston. These two Committees have, no doubt, proved inefficient and either unwilling or incapable of giving a practical form to the thought which has met with their approval. By doing nothing towards a positive organization of the *Alliance*, they have devolved the task upon us and, in a matter so important for us all, it is, not only our right, but our duty to go on and try to succeed. Still, both on account of kindness and of success, the first men to give their moral adhesion ought not to be hurt and entirely neglected. I think we ought to tell them: "your position and your connections make it impossible for you to follow up the practical consequences of the scheme: we shall do that for you; but we hope that your assent will be continued and that in all possible ways, you will countenance our efforts." Think of it and do what you can. To offend them might do a great deal of harm.

The notes are getting ready and you shall have a large number soon. You will have only one with my signature, although I do not see clearly the reason for its not being reproduced *here* on all.

I am at work with Rome, and it is highly probable that we shall act there, perhaps within the February or in March. It *may* be that

we act in a republican sense throughout Italy, the republican Party is daily increasing. But I am sadly deficient in material means. A revolution is impending in Spain. A general rising is on preparation in the East. In France, L. N. is losing ground very fast. Material means would give us more and more the power of a centralizing body and that power would increase the chances of the general movement adopting our flag. Any manifestation of sympathy from the U. S.—any advice in a republican sense given by the Press and reproduced by us through the European papers—any energetic action towards the emancipation of Mexico from monarchical rule—would be valuable too. Have it in mind.

Any contact of mine with American agents abroad, especially in Rome, would be highly important.

I wish you would see, in a friendly way, Gerrit Smith and Stearns. The first *might* I fancy, be induced to an individual offering to me for Rome.

Of course, financing matters, so far as journeys and other expenses are concerned, will be amicably arranged between us.

I am not well and with plenty of pressing work. I cannot now write more, but as soon as the organization is afloat, I shall keep you *au courant* and do anything you will require.

Ever faithfully yours

JOS. MAZZINI

22-67

How great is the influence of Blind<sup>36</sup> on the Germans in the U. S.? I send you an Italian copy of my Manifesto. An English mss. translation has been sent—and has been received—to the N. Y. and to the Bost. Committees. Why it has not been published I do not know. I certainly would have liked it to be known in the U. S.

<sup>36</sup> Karl Blind was one of the exiled leaders of the Baden revolt in 1848-49. He retired to England, where he devoted himself to political writing.

## REVIEW ARTICLE

---

### SOME RECENT TEXTBOOKS

**T**EXTBOOKS in history continue to appear in considerable numbers, partly at least because each publisher wants a complete line, partly because they need periodically to be brought up to date and, as the prefaces would say, in line with the most recent scholarship. Still another reason is a growing interest in more specialized fields in which college courses are being offered. Following the notable development in Latin-American history, the expansion of Europe, the Far East, the British Empire, Canada, and Russia are now calling for texts, some of them still in vain. A more important reason for the appearance of new texts in old fields is the prevailing uncertainty as to the subject matter to be included and the manner of presentation.

The broadening effect of the "new history" has for some time been quite apparent in the lessened emphasis on political, constitutional, and military matters, and the inclusion of economic, institutional, social, and geographic material, together with greater attention to the history of thought, philosophic, scientific, and religious, and to its expression in literature and the arts. There is a recognizable tendency to make history the story of the development of civilization through the centuries as produced by the various combinations of the physical and social inheritance and environment of the different human groups involved.

But writers of history texts are not entirely free to work out what they may regard as their particular contributions to education. They must for one thing take no more of the pupil's time than the educational authorities are willing to allot them, and the competition of natural science, of the other social studies, and of vocational and professional training is increasingly keen. In addition there is an often-voiced insistence that history must contribute not only to general culture and mental discipline, but to better citizenship. Not all historians are hopeful that this can be done, but a respectable proportion of them are willing to make the attempt.

Along with various new plans and experimental colleges there have grown up at various levels a number of introductions to contemporary civilization, orientation courses, survey courses, citizenship courses. They are all designed to make the student better acquainted with the world in which he lives. In most of them a study of the past has some place, but there has naturally been a new selection from the material available and a new emphasis. There have been attempts to study a particular limited epoch, like Periclean Athens, in all its aspects as a living whole for purposes of comparison and contrast with contemporary America as a going concern. There are those who insist on

studying first the contemporary social, political, and economic order, introducing the historical background as it seems called for. Others take various human "problems" and discuss past and present attempts at solving them.

Perhaps the most numerous group retains the chronological order and attempts to picture with broad strokes the general sweep of the main trends of civilization. In a way this amounts to a revival of old-fashioned courses in general history, but with a rather different content and purpose. Perhaps under the influence of Wells and Van Loon such courses begin if not always with the evolution of the earth and of life at least with the Dawn Man. After a few kind words for the basic contributions of the Stone Ages, a section is devoted to the civilization of the ancient Orient in the Nile Valley, the Fertile Crescent, and the Aegean. Some writers include also outlines of Indian, Chinese, and even Central American civilization and history, with a discussion later of the effects of Mongol and other Asiatic impacts on Europe. Other authors mention these topics only to express regret that they have no space available for anything but the cultures which lie in the direct line of descent of our own Western type of civilization. With the coming of the Indo-European Persians and Greeks, the framework of narrative history becomes a little more detailed, but emphasis continues to be placed on the permanent contributions to Western culture of Greece, Rome, and Palestine. The Byzantine Empire receives much more sympathetic attention than used to be the case. The same holds true of Islamic history and culture, particularly in their influence on the West. The Dark Ages and the Middle Ages are treated as an integral part of Western development. The feudal-manorial-Christian order is described as an institutional whole, and its spiritual, intellectual, and artistic ideas and expressions are described. The general significance of the conflict of the Empire and the papacy, the Crusades, and the Hundred Years' War is brought out; but in general political history is minimized and the space saved is devoted to such subjects as scholasticism, Gothic art, and vernacular literature. Then turning toward the modern period, the story treats of towns and the middle class, of the rise of national monarchies, of the expansion of Europe and the commercial revolution, of the Renaissance and Reformation, both as reinterpreted by recent studies. Then there is a discussion of the new science and the intellectual revolution of the Enlightenment. This is followed, with variations in order, by the political revolutions in England, America, and France; the machine age and the industrial revolution; the fortunes of nationalism, liberalism, socialism, conservatism, imperialism, and internationalism in the period since the French Revolution. Developments in science are more consistently discussed than those in the humanities. At the end of the work one is pretty sure to find a section looking forward, urging the student to utilize the information and inspiration gleaned from the preceding 875 pages to make his own experience richer and to take an active and intelligent part in building not only a better social, political, and economic order in our

own beloved land, based on a sane nationalism, but also to work with hand, heart, and brain for world-peace and a co-operative humanity and an era of goodness, truth, beauty, justice, sanitation, and literacy.

There are those who look askance at all such one-volume attempts to introduce a high-school student or a college freshman to the whole history of civilization. They speak contemptuously of "hash" courses. They fear that instead of knowing something about a limited field the student will know nothing about everything. On the other hand it is urged that an airplane survey, ignoring minor details, may be of the greatest service in showing the general course of events and bringing out the broad relationships between different periods and different fields of knowledge as a basis for later specialization. At any rate, the experiment is being widely attempted, and it is certainly premature to call it a failure.

Three recent texts,<sup>1</sup> primarily for secondary schools, are constructed along the general lines indicated above: *The march of civilization* by Professor Wrench of the University of Missouri, *Man's great adventure* by Professor Pahlow of Ohio State, *World history* by Professors Hayes and Moon of Columbia, in collaboration with Professor Wayland of Virginia State Teachers College. They cover about the same sweep from prehistoric man to the depression. All are provided with well-chosen illustrations and maps, as well as brief bibliographies and questions. There are also time charts and diagrams, those in Pahlow being particularly numerous and ingenious. The *World history* includes chapters on India, the Far East, Latin America, and the United States. Wrench has a chapter on nationality and democracy in the Americas, and Asiatic history and culture receive attention in several chapters. Pahlow has little on these, and gives relatively less space to the Middle Ages. On the whole, *Man's great adventure* departs rather more from the pattern of historical narrative and is quite successfully informal in style. All are mildly revisionist on war responsibility. While soundly enough nationalistic, all sympathize with world-peace and co-operation. That democracy must yield to either communism or fascism is naturally not admitted. All three texts might well be examined by a teacher responsible for conducting an introductory history of civilization survey.

<sup>1</sup> *The march of civilization: ancient, medieval and modern world.* By JESSE E. WRENCH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. Pp. xxvi+847. \$2.20. Also published in a two-volume edition. Vol. I, *The march of civilization: ancient and medieval world from the beginning to the fall of Constantinople, 1453.* Vol. II, *The march of civilization: modern world, 1453-1931.* Pp. xvi+365+xvii+486. \$3.80.

*Man's great adventure: an introduction to world history.* By EDWIN W. PAHLOW, professor of the teaching of history, Ohio State University. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1932. Pp. xiv+854+xxvi. \$2.12.

*World history.* By CARLTON J. H. HAYES, PARKER THOMAS MOON, and JOHN W. WAYLAND. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Pp. xviii+912. \$2.20.

In addition to these three histories of civilization, two volumes of modern European history have appeared.

The *Modern history*<sup>2</sup> by Professor Becker of Cornell is primarily for high-school use. The style is easy and attractive. The illustrations are numerous and good, and the charts at the end of each chapter visualize the main points covered.

Having decided that modern civilization is characterized by scientific knowledge, economic interdependence, humane feeling and democratic ideas, nationalism and internationalism, the author sketches in some thirty-five pages the civilization of ancient Greece and Rome, and that of the Middle Ages, and suggests the significance of the Renaissance and the Reformation. The second part is called "The age of kings and nobles," and carries the story to the eve of the French Revolution. Then under the heading "The age of the political revolution," the political narrative is carried down to about 1885. The last section, "The age of the industrial revolution," brings in social as well as industrial developments. Imperialistic rivalries outside Europe are described, then the diplomatic background of the war, the war, and the peace settlement. The last chapter depicts "the new world of today, which is only the old world of yesterday trying to get its bearings."

Both in descriptions of particular periods and situations, for instance, the old régime in France, and in narrative of movements such as the unification of Italy, interest is well sustained. The material is overwhelmingly political in character with a generous recognition of the significance of social-economic forces. The development of science is followed, but no place is found for literature, philosophy, religion, or the fine arts. Even if space could not be given for much discussion, their existence even in a "democratic, scientific and industrialized civilization" might be admitted. Similarly, if the history of the United States and Latin America is to be omitted, a fairer title would be "Modern European history," for while Asia and Africa are mentioned, they are pictured primarily as objects of a European colonial scramble. A few judicious paragraphs on the significance of the Europeanizing of the world outside of Europe and on the beginnings of a world-order culturally as well as politically and economically would not have been out of place.

The *Political and cultural history of modern Europe*<sup>3</sup> by Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes of Columbia, the first volume of which has just been issued, is designed for the college student. It constitutes such a radical revision and

<sup>2</sup> *Modern history: the rise of a democratic, scientific, and industrialized civilization.* By CARL L. BECKER, John Stambaugh professor of history, Cornell University. ("The Becker-Duncalf-Magoffin histories.") New York: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1932. Pp. xiii + 825 + xxiv. \$2.24.

<sup>3</sup> *A political and cultural history of modern Europe.* By CARLTON J. H. HAYES. Vol. I, *Three centuries of predominantly agricultural society, 1500-1830.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Pp. xviii + 863. \$3.50.



re-writing of the author's *Political and social history of modern Europe* as to be virtually a new work. "Into the story of how modern Europe has earned a living and been ruled is now woven a story of what it has thought and achieved in science and philosophy, in literature and art. The new synthesis is intended to present not a one-sided, but the many-sided, aspect of modern Europe."

The present volume covers the period to 1830 as compared with 1815 in the earlier first volume. The arrangement of material is simplified and improved. The illustrations are judiciously chosen not only for their historical value but as examples of the various schools of modern art.

In Part I, devoted to the forming of modern Europe, there is little continuous narrative history, but much synthesis and interpretation. Beginning with a political survey about the year 1500, there follows an excellent summary of the economic expansion associated with the expansion of Europe and the rise of capitalism. The Renaissance is discussed as an "intellectual quickening" and the period which a few from force of habit still refer to as the Reformation appears as a "religious upheaval." The rediscovery of classical civilization is given its revised appraisal, and any lingering convictions that Protestantism is primarily responsible for modern religious toleration, democracy, and universal education are firmly corrected.

Part II is devoted to dynastic and economic statecraft, and is rather more narrative in character. Five chapters describe the predominance of Spain and of France, the Austrian Habsburgs and the rise of Prussia, the rise of Russia, and the rise of the British Empire. The material is largely political-social-economic, with only an incidental paragraph or two on art or literature.

Part III is devoted to revolutionary developments of the modern world. The British revolutions include the American, in which the imperial point of view is not so fully or sympathetically set out as is usually the case these days. On the American side the growth of political radicalism appears as the underlying and the tightening of the trade and navigation laws after the removal of the French menace as the immediate cause of trouble.

With the chapter on the intellectual revolution the interest in the "cultural" history of Europe is resumed, and 80 pages are devoted to science, philosophy, religion, social science, and to classicism and dawning romanticism in literature and art. The material is rather condensed, and college students could probably digest a somewhat more fundamental treatment of philosophy. In general, however, the treatment is interesting and the inclusion of these topics will be welcomed by many.

The chapters on the French Revolution and the era of Napoleon resume the political narrative with due attention to their social and economic significance. The chapter on the era of Metternich includes not only the conservative settlement in politics and national and liberal reactions against it down to 1830, but follows the fortunes of romanticism and classicism in the arts and literature to about the same date.

Volume I has as a subtitle "Three centuries of predominantly agricultural society," but apart from a few pages the agricultural basis of society and the existence of the laboring masses are taken for granted, and the usual attention is devoted to the doings of rulers, townsfolk, and intellectuals. One expects that the second volume will be entitled "The era of science and the industrial revolution" and that these factors will be more featured than the agriculture of the first volume.

The changed emphasis of this volume brings it more in line with the tendency we have noted in secondary texts to treat the historical evolution of European civilization more broadly and inclusively. But troublesome problems of proportion still remain to be faced. There must be a framework of political and constitutional history; there must be large attention to social and economic developments. Science must come in, if only because it gave rise to the industrial revolution. What space remains for "culture" in the narrower sense? Of Hayes's 800 pages, a rough estimate shows that 28 are devoted to religion, apart from church organization and conflicts, 24 to art, 10 to philosophy, 18 to science, 20 to literature, 6 to music, and 24 to the social sciences, in all not quite a sixth of the total space. While one could hardly demand treatment on the scale begun by Preserved Smith, or even that of Randall's *Making of the modern mind*, some will probably feel that the *Political and cultural history* would still better justify its title if it could include a somewhat larger proportion of cultural material.

It would be ungracious, however, on the part of one who sympathizes with the inclusion of such material not to express appreciation of what is given.

Exception might be taken to the impression left by certain condensed statements, such as that Anne Boleyn was "executed for adultery" (p. 239), that England "obtained" Newfoundland and Hudson's Bay from France in 1713 (p. 310), that Russians were "saturated" with Asiatic customs and habits (p. 360), that "gold coins are still often called 'guineas' in England" (p. 397 n.), and that Georgia "was established as a camp for transported criminals" (p. 406 n.).

In the field of English history three texts appear in new editions,<sup>4</sup> brought down to date but not otherwise extensively changed. Cheyney's *Short history* has long made a place for itself. Larson's *History of England and the British*

<sup>4</sup> *A short history of England*. By EDWARD P. CHEYNEY, professor of European history in the University of Pennsylvania. New edition. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1932. Pp. xvi+790+xviii. \$2.20.

*A history of England and the British Commonwealth*. By LAURENCE M. LARSON, professor of history in the University of Illinois. Revised edition. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1932. Pp. x+916. \$4.00.

*A political and social history of England*. By FREDERICK C. DIETZ, Ph.D., professor of history in the University of Illinois. Revised edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Pp. xxii+786. \$3.25.

*Commonwealth* in the "American historical series" gives more attention to the Empire as a whole than does Cheyney. So does Dietz in his *Political and social history of England*. None of the volumes professes to be a history of British civilization. Both Dietz and Larson, however, include brief mention of cultural topics. Both give the usual attention to economic and social topics, Dietz making a particular point of beginning each period "with the examination of the fundamental changes in industry and agriculture as the background against which political and cultural activity may be reflected more vividly."

Two further volumes, connected only by the accident of publication date, conclude our list of recent texts.

The fourth edition of the *History of the British Empire*<sup>5</sup> by C. S. S. Higham has two additional chapters covering developments in the Commonwealth and India during the last ten years. It is rather condensed to serve as a basic text for a college course.

*The first three hundred years in America*<sup>6</sup> by Clark and Gordy is an elementary-school story of the Colonial period. Over a third of the space is devoted to Latin-American and French settlements. The material seems well selected and interestingly told.

Except that they are all intended as texts, it is difficult to find any common denominator for such a variety of books. With due allowance for the different levels at which they are aimed, they may be rated from fair to excellent, particularly by comparison with texts of forty years or more ago. The dictum that each generation rewrites the history of the past in terms of its own contemporary outlook is measurably true of the volumes just considered. The economic background of the machine age, the intellectual background of the age of science, the antecedents of an imperialistic yet partly internationalized world-order, are given particular attention. Something of post-war disillusionment may be reflected in a treatment of bourgeois individualism, nationalism, and democracy which seldom takes for granted that they represent ultimate goals of social organization, and no longer points all history to their triumphs in the later nineteenth century.

Whether history be regarded as a social science, with emphasis on both social and science, or whether it be only a particularly fact-bound form of literature, it is unsafe to speak of its progress without a definition of objectives. It is, however, safe to say that the writing of history texts is changing, and even a cautious reviewer may say that in his opinion it is changing for the better.

ARTHUR P. SCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>5</sup> *History of the British Empire*, By C. S. S. HIGHAM. With 15 maps. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1931. Pp. x+308. \$1.75.

<sup>6</sup> *The first three hundred years in America*. By MARION G. CLARK and WILBUR FISK GORDY. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. Pp. xii+436. \$1.20.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*A history of Sweden.* By ANDREW A. STOMBERG, professor of the Scandinavian languages and literature, University of Minnesota, formerly professor of history, Gustavus Adolphus College. New York: Macmillan Co., 1931. Pp. xiv+823. \$8.50.

The excellent, although somewhat sketchy, *History of Sweden* by Carl Hallendorff and Adolf Schüick (Stockholm, 1929) is now admirably supplemented by Professor Stomberg's book. It is no easy task to write a complete history of Sweden in eight hundred pages. It requires skill and comprehensive knowledge. This has been evidenced by Mr. Stomberg who has made a thorough use of the co-operative work by Sweden's leading historians, *Sveriges historia till våra dagar* (Stockholm, 1915—), and has interspersed his narrative with references to monographs and to primary sources. His attractive and comprehensive volume will serve as a good textbook because of its convenient size, its encyclopedic character and balance, the valuable illustrations and maps, the well-proportioned analysis of the political, social, and cultural development of the Swedish people through their entire existence.

The narrative itself gives the reader a clear picture of the rather unusual history of a very small group of people, living in a relatively limited geographical region for thousands of years—a people which never suffered successful subjugation by invaders but which time and again sent forth wave upon wave of invaders into other regions; e.g., in the period of the migration of nations (chap. ii), in the Viking age (chaps. iii and iv), in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when they built an empire (chaps. xii ff.), and in the nineteenth century when they migrated to nearly all parts of the world.

Some minor criticisms may be noted. For example, Mr. Stomberg does not make it clear that Nicholas Breakspeare (p. 137) is the same as Nicholas, cardinal of Albano (p. 142), and who, it could have been stated, later was elevated to the papal chair as Adrian IV, the only Englishman to attain this distinction. The author does not set forth (p. 159) the meaning of Valdemar's cognomen "Atterdag" usually accepted by Scandinavian scholars (cf. the discussion of this topic by C. E. F. Reinhardt, *Valdemar Atterdag og Hans Kongegjerning* [Copenhagen, 1880]). It is probably only a slip of the pen when the author states (p. 167) that Duke Albrecht of Mecklenburg "made haste to claim the Danish throne for his son." Duke Albrecht made this claim for his grandson, Albrecht the Younger. Furthermore, the author does not emphasize the important rôle that the Hanseatic League played in Scandinavian, and naturally in Swedish, affairs in the middle ages. A casual perusal

only of Tunberg's *Äldre Medeltiden* (Vol. II of *Sveriges historia till våra dagar*) would have convinced the author of the importance of this subject. The Peace of Stralsund, 1370, so profoundly important for Scandinavian affairs for at least a century and a half, receives no mention. Sweden's part in undermining the League's supremacy in Baltic affairs receives only incidental mention by the author (chaps. x and ff.; cf. Johannes Paul, *Lubeck und die Wasa im 16. Jahrhundert* [Lübeck, 1920]). But all these criticisms are trivial when set against the solid value of the work as a whole.

DAVID K. BJORK

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

---

*Fools and folly during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.* By BARBARA SWAIN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 234. \$3.00.

The writer on fools *must* choose; for though their number be a little less than infinite, no one alive or dead perhaps has escaped the classification. Miss Swain is undoubtedly right in believing that the heyday of fools, if not the height of folly, was attained in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. To this period, for the most part, she confines her exposition, with the further arbitrary limitation to certain types of fools manifest in the literatures of France and England. Yet these include translations; and the "two chief works" for her analysis are the *Ship of fools* by the Swabian, Sebastian Brant, and *The praise of folly* by the first citizen of the Republic of Letters, Erasmus.

Before the richer fare, however, come half a dozen courses: first the old, unpleasant dosage of medicine, drawn from *Proverbs* and administered by moralists and theologians to human beings in order to cure their folly, i.e., their sin; then literary morsels, wherein fooldom is somewhat nearer the kingdom of wisdom—as in Lydgate's *The order of fools*; then comes "The fool in person," who is alive and salty and whets the appetite. For these, as well as "The joyous societies" of sixteenth-century France and "The fool in the sotties" there is always a scholarly and sensitive presentation, though the matter of folly, be assured, is not always a genuine *apéritif*.

But none glared upon the worldly preserves of Folly with such drastic heat as Brant; none illuminated more brightly her ways among mankind than did Erasmus. Brant saw folly as sin and sin as folly; moved by a kindlier human philosophy, Erasmus played about human weakness with wit and a supple ironic sword. Miss Swain is keenly alive to their differences (pp. 133-34); but with critical strokes of a bolder force she might here have disclosed the cleavage of Middle Ages and Renaissance in one of its particular manifestations. Brant saw coming the Flood which would submerge the Ship of Fools; his refuge was the Ark of the old established order, the medieval order. Behind the Erasmian laughter and irony, however, lay what was most essential in the humanism of the Renaissance, belief in the worth and dignity of man.

The author knows of the still wider fields of folly—"the popularity of the fool as a literary figure was perhaps greatest in Germany, and certainly extended to Italy." Fools were numerous, and often famous, in Italian courts, the papal court included. One might begin the study of them in the richly illustrated pages of F. Malaguzzi Valeri's *La corte di Lodovico il Moro* (Vol. I; Milan, 1913) and follow his references. Of the critical literature not used by Miss Swain, perhaps the most notably important is the study of Brant by Charles Schmidt in his *Histoire littéraire de l'Alsace*. Huizinga's *Waning of the Middle Ages* deserves consideration in any study of the temper of the fifteenth century. Mrs. P. S. Allen's introduction to the old Wilson translation of *The praise of folly* (Oxford, 1925) is worth consulting.

ERNEST W. NELSON

DUKE UNIVERSITY

---

*Historical evolution of Hispanic America.* By J. FRED RIPPY, professor of history, Duke University. New York: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1932. Pp. xvii+580. \$5.00.

The book under review will serve as a very useful college text and guide to the general reader. In its preparation Professor Rippy has set down for himself five objectives. These aims are as expressed in the preface:

(1) To strike a proper balance between solid facts, synthesis, and interpretation; (2) to treat the colonial era in such manner as to give a correct impression of the movement of the stream of history through a period of three centuries, and especially to convey an adequate impression of change and progress between the years of 1600 and 1750; (3) to avoid the handbook method in dealing with the national period and give the student the benefit of suggestions regarding the similarities and contrasts in the historical development of the twenty republics of Hispanic America; (4) to emphasize the important changes which have taken place in the region since the beginning of the second decade of the twentieth century; and (5) to present an adequate survey of the foreign relations of these nations.

In a clear and interesting style the author has largely succeeded in accomplishing these aims.

The opening chapters of the book are devoted to the New World background for later developments. One chapter, inadequate because of its brevity, gives something of the Old World background; and the Spanish colonial period is covered in three interesting and stimulating chapters. A happy division of this period is made under the titles "A century of marvelous achievements," "Spanish America under the later Hapsburgs," and "Spanish America under the Bourbons." Here again, however, one wishes for a fuller discussion of the subject. A better balance would have been attained had these chapters been more detailed at the expense of later chapters dealing with international relations. A satisfactory discussion of Spain's efforts,

achievements, and failures in America and a clear description of institutions and conditions existing at the close of the colonial period can scarcely be presented in sixty-seven pages.

In an excellent chapter covering the wars for independence, Mr. Rippy emphasizes the importance of new ideas as the great spiritual force back of the heroic struggle. Their importance has been underestimated by many students. The problems of independence are ably discussed in a chapter which has not been equaled by other writers of survey histories of the republics.

The difficult task of narrating clearly yet briefly the events of the early national period is accomplished here. The nature of the volume necessitates the omission of many comparatively important facts, but in general the author has selected the materials carefully and wisely. However, to dismiss the subject of the French intervention in Mexico with the sentence "Into the details of Napoleon's Mexican undertaking it is unnecessary to go" (p. 422) seems unwise. Also the reader is left in the dark regarding the movements of the Spanish and British expeditions; but the seriousness of these defects pales before such outstanding sections of the book as that called "Profit and loss" in chapter xi. Here the author's real grasp of the subject is clearly evident.

The number of chapters and the space devoted to foreign relations appear to be out of proportion to the other sections of this work. The reviewer feels that some of these chapters might well have been condensed, especially the comparatively lengthy discussion of the rivalry between the United States and Great Britain. Chapters dealing with the French and German relations might have been combined and shortened.

The closing chapters of the book provide very useful and up-to-date discussions of such important phases of Hispanic American affairs as the Pan-Hispanic and Pan-American movements, as well as a narration and explanation of the events of the last three years.

Mr. Rippy explains in the preface his reasons for not including more material on the literary, artistic, and educational achievements of the people whose history he is considering, but the inclusion of such material would nevertheless have enhanced the value of the book for text purposes. The volume includes a number of very helpful maps, a useful index, and a well-selected bibliography.

JOHN C. PATTERSON

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE

---

*Dissolution of the Virginia Company: the failure of a colonial experiment.* By WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN, PH.D., assistant professor of history, New York University. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. vi+350. \$3.00.

The task which Professor Craven has ably performed is that of examining and reinterpreting in the light of seventeenth-century conditions the documentary evidence, mostly *ex parte* in nature, which has so readily made this

a controversial subject. The result of the undertaking, aside from added information concerning the colony of Virginia and the management of its concerns, is a very hard blow to what remains of the traditional theory that the Virginia Company fell because of an opposition which was primarily political. The author in his introductory chapter presents an account of the rise of this opinion, plausible as a general explanation, but essentially founded upon conjecture and upon a certain amount of misunderstanding of records. He well understands the dislike of James I for Sir Edwin Sandys and the political opinions of the latter, and he appreciates the belief of the partisans of Sandys that they suffered from the influence of Gondomar and the pro-Spanish party at court. But the report of Gondomar's prophecy to King James that the meetings of the Company would prove "a seminary for a seditious parliament" is shown to come from a story at third hand repeated from memory thirty years after the supposed event. Moreover, Professor A. P. Newton has already made it clear enough that the combination of the Warwick with the Smith faction against Sandys, in the light of Warwick's more than questionable activities against Spanish ships, must be regarded as anything but a pro-Spanish move. What tells still further against the old explanation is the fact that the report of these activities to the privy council at the insistence of the Sandys party was one main cause of the breach between them and Warwick. On the other hand, a suggestion which has been advanced by one writer seems to go too far. Had Gondomar understood that the attack on the Company was to be followed by the direct control of the crown in Virginia, he could hardly have expected Spain to profit from the change; but Mr. Craven's account of the investigation of Virginia affairs in 1623 makes it very doubtful whether anyone knew what the outcome would be. The crown officials were willing in that year to allow the Company to continue under a new charter which permitted royal control of the appointment of the governing board. This may be construed as implying political opposition. It is more easily explained as a mark of discontent with its general administration of Virginia affairs.

The inherent defect of the traditional view is not any impossibility that Spanish influence or that of King James entered into the situation. Nothing is definitely known of these matters. The old explanation is too simple and, like many such explanations, both overlooks and assumes too much. From the pages written by Edward Channing over a quarter of a century ago one may gather that the heavy indebtedness of the Virginia Company as well as the schism within its membership affected the situation perhaps quite as much as the wrath or the statecraft of James I. The facts presented by W. R. Scott a few years later raise the gravest doubt whether, even in the sunshine of the royal favor, the Company could have survived. It is with a full appreciation of what earlier writers have done that the author of this volume sets out not only to disprove what he regards as a false thesis, but also to fill gaps in the story. In the opinion of the reviewer he has admirably attained both objectives.



The known evidence fails to show that the downfall of the Virginia Company was regarded at the time as a feature of the political opposition of the court to the Puritan or "patriot" party of which Sandys was a prominent leader. The defeat in 1623 of the lord treasurer's tobacco contract, which Sandys had strong personal reasons for supporting, came of course through the opposition of the Smith-Warwick coalition. Mr. Craven makes it very clear that in 1624 the house of commons under provoking circumstances failed to treat the dissolution of the Company as a political issue. Certain persons petitioned the house for a restoration of the rights they had lost through the dissolution, making the most of the opportunity to urge the adverse influence of Gondomar and his successor and to indict the Earl of Middlesex, the lord treasurer. After the matter had been referred to a committee of the whole house, a letter from the king stated that his own commissioners were making every effort to settle justly questions pertaining to Virginia, and that, since interference by parliament would only bring a renewal of factional feeling, all further discussion in the house was to be prohibited. Even under these circumstances assent to the message was given in silence. The only report of concern in the matter has to do with the fear that King James might also intervene to check proceeds upon the impeachment of Middlesex which Sandys and Sir Edward Coke had recently laid before the lords.

Again, the author shows reason for holding that the establishment of an assembly in Virginia met general approval as an improvement in the Company's plan of administration, and that in any event it could not have been a cause of hostility against the Sandys group. It is well known that this had been fully arranged by Smith and his party while in power before 1619 and that they selected Captain George Yeardley to succeed Samuel Argall as governor of the colony. In 1620, without adverse political effect, the same element introduced an assembly in Bermuda, which was still under their control. The fact that Charles I in 1627 specifically approved the retention of the Virginia assembly indicates that it had not aroused the opposition of the court. The charge of "democratical" or popular government which entered into the investigation of 1623 was in effect the technical ground upon which the King's Bench sustained the *quo warranto* the next year. This, Mr. Craven shows, can hardly be interpreted as bearing upon the Company's assembly for its settlers in Virginia, but clearly does refer to the conduct of its courts in England. The difficulty, well recognized by Mr. Scott, lay in a vote not of stock but of stockholders. The control of the Sandys faction rested upon the fact that small stockholders were allowed the same voice as the original grantees. The control of affairs by a majority thus obtained and manipulated was judicially pronounced an usurpation.

The situation which led to the investigation of Virginia affairs by the privy council in 1623 resulted from the policy and administration of the ruling Sandys faction. They had a larger financial stake in Virginia than their opponents of the Smith group, who were more largely interested in Bermuda.

They resorted to rapid colonization to bring the profits of labor to the support of an organization on the verge of bankruptcy. The spread of settlement which resulted was responsible for the Indian massacre of 1622. Still more disastrous to the reputation of the Company was the failure or inability of Ferrar, the deputy treasurer, to provide food, shelter, and clothing for the numbers constantly sent out against the protest of the authorities in Virginia. The poor quality and insufficient quantity of the food supplied were alone responsible for a terrific rate of mortality. At the same time the freemen of the colony, not bound to labor on shares, and the colonists on the lands of private landowners were in a far better condition. The situation was the more hopeless because of the insistence at home upon the production of staples other than tobacco, the only commodity which produced an income. This crop for two years had been shipped to Holland because of attempts to curtail the home market, but in face of orders of the privy council to the contrary. When a discontented group of stockholders in 1623 asked for an investigation, this irregularity along with the high death-rate among the colonists and the sad condition of the survivors told heavily against the Company. Nor is the intervention of the privy council to be regarded as malicious, for it was simply a part of the duty of that body at the time.

The work contains an interesting explanation of the territorial hundred in early Virginia. This, the author finds, did not represent any attempt to establish a systematic territorial subdivision. The Virginia hundreds more nearly resembled feudal manors with a certain political and economic independence. The term was not applied to all private settlements, and seems to have been a colloquial designation of plantations to which had been given no definite name.

WILLIAM A. MORRIS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*The Company of Scotland trading to Africa and the Indies.* By GEORGE PRATT INSH. London and New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. Pp. 343. \$4.00.

The foremost authority on early Scottish colonial enterprise presents in this volume an ideal monograph. Its theme is the struggle of the Scots for a share of the benefits of colonies and oversea trade. The story at most points is interwoven with the central threads of European history. Mr. Insh has used all the available material, particularly the records of the Company itself. He has struck a happy balance between the general and the particular. A fulness of knowledge, a sureness of touch, and a flowing narrative and vivid description have all produced a significant and readable book, scholarly but not dull. People, lands, policies, and voyages are blended together into a synthesis that combines emphasis, perspective, and interest with a sense of reality. Mr. Insh has said the last word on this subject for many days to come.

The story opens with the passage in 1693 of the Scottish act for encouraging trade. Then follows an account of the launching of the Company, and its efforts to secure capital and ships in Scotland, London, Amsterdam, and Hamburg. The idea of the Scots was to plant a colony at Darien which would take off the products of their growing industries and become the emporium of the oriental trade. Two chapters tell fully and graphically the fate of the two Darien expeditions of 1698-99 and 1699-1700, and sketch the part of the Company in Anglo-Spanish diplomacy, in Anglo-Scottish relations, and in Scottish politics. The remaining four chapters deal with individual trading voyages, in only one of which the Company succeeded. The Company appears as a great national enterprise that stirred the Scots alternately with hope of gain and desire for revenge.

Several things contributed to the ultimate failure of the Company. The English government was steadily opposed and did all in its power to obstruct. The English feared a rival of their own East India Company, and they did not care to antagonize Spain in the Caribbean. The Dutch East India Company withheld aid at Amsterdam. Scotland lacked ships, provisions, capital, and trading goods which the Company needed. Spain, of course, denied the Company's claims, and took prisoner the settlers of the second expedition. The Company's career, however, helped to effect the union of 1707. Moreover, its operations—misconstrued by the Spaniards in 1700 as evidence of English aggression—contributed to the union of France and Spain just before the War of the Spanish Succession.

CURTIS NETTELS

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

---

*Marlborough.* By the HON. SIR JOHN FORTESCUE, LL.D., D. LITT.  
London: Peter Davies, Ltd., 1932. Pp. 175. 5s.

The historian of the British army has attempted to describe the military career of one of the three outstanding generals of the English race in less than forty thousand words. It is astonishing how much he has been able to do in so small a space. The style is terse but charming, and carries the reader along at a breathless pace from the first page to the last. It is easily the best summary of Marlborough's career. It is so good that we hope that the author may give us the definite life of the great duke, which was denied us by Mr. Frank Taylor's death. This work does not pretend to be a work of critical scholarship, but is intended for the general reader. It is not encumbered by footnotes, and the maps are few and simple. The bibliography covers one small page, in which the author humbly confesses that the "French archives for this period I fear that I have not studied."

The necessity for summary statements has led the author into a few errors. The Whigs did not have a majority in 1707; that had to wait until the election of the next year. Despite the pig-headed obstinacy of the Dutch and the

interminable delays of the Imperialists, it is entirely true to say that "England under his guidance was working for a common cause but she worked alone. Every other member of the Alliance was working for herself" (p. 105). Sir John claims that the abortive expedition of the Pretender of the same year was "easily foiled by Marlborough's naval and military dispositions." It has usually been assumed that the measles contracted by the Pretender delayed the expedition sufficiently for Admiral Byng to prepare for it (p. 109). Marlborough's voice was supposedly "squeaky" (p. 155).

WILLIAM THOMAS MORGAN

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

---

*Stanhope: a study in eighteenth century war and diplomacy.* By BASIL WILLIAMS. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 478+xv. \$5.00.

One difficulty in approaching the career of Stanhope arises from its division into two distinct periods. For much the greater part of his life Stanhope was a soldier, but his comparatively brief activities as secretary of state were far more important than his soldiering, and Professor Williams has recognized this unequal balance of interest by devoting only a quarter of his space to the first forty-one years of Stanhope's life, and the remainder of his book to those last seven years during which Stanhope was virtually foreign minister under George I.

The section which deals with Stanhope as a soldier is well done. On the familiar issues of the respective credit to be given for English successes in Spain to Peterborough, Leake, and Stanhope, the author is very fair if somewhat noncommittal, finding more to say for Peterborough than was admitted by Parnell, and being kinder to Leake than was Stanhope's own descendant, Mahon. In general, he makes no great claim for Stanhope as a commander, regarding him as an example of "the brave but unscientific soldier" (pp. 117-20). On the subject of the final disaster at Brihuega, he is scrupulously fair, but he omits any mention of the advice said to have been given to Stanhope by General Carpenter (cf. Boyer's *Annals of Queen Anne*) that the cavalry should be allowed to leave the besieged town while there was yet time and that the foot and baggage should be withdrawn within the castle. Had this been done, it would have facilitated the defense, and would have secured an economy in the use of ammunition for lack of which the besieged were compelled to surrender. It must be admitted, however, that when Stanhope declined this advice he was still in hourly expectation of the arrival of help from the Imperialists under Starhemberg.

For Stanhope as foreign minister, Mr. Williams makes the highest claims (pp. 1 and 444). His chief praise is reserved for Stanhope as the architect of the Triple Alliance (pp. 228-29) and as the author of the settlement thereby

imposed upon Spain and the Emperor in the following year (pp. 310-13). The great value to England of Stanhope's alliance with France cannot be denied, but not everyone will agree with Mr. Williams in his praise of the settlement of 1718 as being of high value to Europe as a whole and to Italy in particular. Its purpose was to find some accommodation of the rival discontents felt by Spain and the Emperor with the Treaty of Utrecht. Even supposing that the Spain of Alberoni was too restive to come into any understanding with England and France save on her own terms, was it necessary to join with Austria in fighting Spain? Granted that Stanhope's French ally would never have consented to the Emperor's aggrandizement without adequate compensation being given to Spain, was it necessary to aggrandize the Emperor? Mr. Williams claims that Stanhope had been schooled by Marlborough in the importance of the Mediterranean, and that English interests made it imperative that Spain should not hold Sicily. But was the cession of the island to Austria the only or the best alternative? Bolingbroke had been very much alive to English interests in the Mediterranean and the pivot of his policy was the retention of Sicily by the House of Savoy. When Mr. Williams points out that the settlement of 1718 was a first faint step in the direction of keeping Italy for the Italians, it is fair to add that Bolingbroke's policy of enlarging and strengthening Piedmont was even more consonant with that development. It is at least a possible view that while the allies of 1718 joined to maintain the treaties in spite of Spain, they connived at breaches of the treaties by Austria. For George I and Stanhope, however, the question of treaty rights in Italy was of secondary importance. Their alliance with the Emperor involved them in the questions at issue between Austria and Spain, and their alliance with the regent prevented them from anticipating Fleury and settling those questions by an understanding between England, France, and Spain. Granted that given the dynastic position at home and in France the alliance with the Regent and with the Emperor were necessary, that need not blind us to the essential opportunism of Stanhope's policy in the south or to the damage which it involved to English trade.

A similar doubt must attend Mr. Williams' claims for Stanhope's mediation in the north. In this matter also, Stanhope's vital service to England cannot be called in question. The shifting balance in the north was beyond his power to alter or arrest, but he could and did secure that the troubles from which the new balance was to rise should not be used by a foreign power to unseat the new dynasty at home. That great achievement conceded, however, what remained? From Stanhope's peace in the north Hanover benefited greatly, Prussia considerably, England but little. From the dire extremity of Sweden, who had relied on his help, he had extracted concessions to his allies, the counterobligations for which it was impossible he should perform. Above all, his attempt to check the growing naval power of Russia signally failed. Nor did that power, as it affected England, justify the alarm with which Stanhope,

in common, it is true, with most of his contemporaries, had watched its inception.

To this extent there may be disagreement with Mr. Williams' claims for Stanhope as a statesman of European stature. There will be none with his view of Stanhope's foreign policy as buttressing by foreign alliances and confirming by foreign peace the dynastic settlement which the Whigs had made at home. A writer less Whig in sympathy might have pointed out that in this regard the pivot of Stanhope's policy, his alliance with France, was a breach with Whig tradition and a logical inheritance from Bolingbroke.<sup>1</sup> But Mr. Williams has obviously no liking for Bolingbroke (pp. 18-20). He writes (p. 131) that in 1714 Bolingbroke believed in the possibility of a Stuart restoration, only to admit (p. 140) that Bolingbroke never entertained any idea of stirring on behalf of James Edward unless the latter would accept the Anglican religion. He regards the enlightened commercial treaty with France of 1713 as the work of Oxford and Bolingbroke (p. 133) although it is at least probable that Oxford contributed deliberately, or through irresolution, to its defeat.<sup>2</sup> He regards Harley and St. John as "intriguing for the removal of Godolphin" in 1707 (p. 65) although there is no evidence, apart from the suspicions of Marlborough's duchess, that St. John had any share in Harley's maneuvers at that date. St. John had become uneasy as Marlborough and Godolphin gave themselves increasingly into Whig hands,<sup>3</sup> and it is noteworthy that as early as 1705 he was already putting forward his later argument that England was carrying too great a share of the burden of the war,<sup>4</sup> but these things give no basis for a charge of intriguing against his chiefs.

Apart from these points, the chapters on domestic policy are among the best things in the book. It may be that much of the Whig alarm as to the succession in 1714 was more unnecessary than Mr. Williams would admit, but in Stanhope it was probably genuine, and the reader may well leave this book with the belief that Stanhope's contribution to the securing of the Hanoverian Succession was, as with his soldiering, not so much any outstanding ability as a singleness of purpose and conviction which was lacking both in his ally Marlborough and in his opponents Oxford and Bolingbroke.

H. N. FIELDHOUSE

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

<sup>1</sup> There is a passage in Stanhope's Letter Book for 1716 (P.R.O.) which shows that he believed that the Anglo-French entente would become permanent.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Carte MSS in the Bodleian 231, fol. 36a; Bolingbroke Correspondence, IV, 166 and 201; and D. A. E. Harkness, "The opposition to the 8th and 9th articles of the commercial treaty of Utrecht," *Scottish historical review*, XXI (1924), 219-26.

<sup>3</sup> *H. MSS Bath*, I, 121, 191-92.

<sup>4</sup> *H. MSS Russell-Astley*, pp. 186-87.

*Maria Theresa of Austria.* By J. ALEXANDER MAHAN. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1932. Pp. xiii+366. \$3.75.

In the face of Arneth's monumental 10-volume work on Maria Theresa (Vienna, 1863-79) it requires courage for any man to write a new book on the Austrian empress-queen. Dr. Mahan (M.D.), a free-lance writer now living in Vienna, has neither the training nor the background to make any contribution or add anything new to what we already know about Maria Theresa.

One could dismiss this book as another piece of historical hack writing were it not for the fact that it is illustrative of the modern tendency in popular historical writing. Unlike most other popularizers, Dr. Mahan has given us an opportunity to see his method. He has appended a bibliography of thirty titles, one of them being a well-known American textbook which the author naïvely informs us, he has "drawn upon . . . for general historical facts concerning the period of Maria Theresa." Dr. Mahan has relied almost entirely on Arneth's *Geschichte Maria Theresias* and the third volume of Coxe's *History of the house of Austria*. His knowledge of Frederick II comes from Margaret Goldsmith's *Frederick the Great*, and what he knows about Catherine II is gleaned from Katharine Anthony's *Catherine the Great*, two books which are no better and no worse than they should be. The author also occasionally quotes from Carlyle's hysterical panegyric of eight volumes on Frederick II. Dr. Mahan seems unaware of the standard source material for the period.

Where Dr. Mahan takes directly from Arneth, his facts are generally right; where Arneth cannot guide him, he fumbles. Thus he repeats the old fairy tale that Catherine II "instituted many reforms in Russia" (p. 95) and that she "hated Frederick" (p. 221), neither of which statements is true. There are such surprising platitudes in this book as the one about Charles VI who was "dead of a broken heart" (p. 57), that "Mark Antony changed history by his oration over the body of Julius Caesar" (p. 123), that Frederick's successes "set him dreaming of becoming a Caesar or an Alexander" (p. 200), that after Frederick conquered Silesia his "conscience pricked him most annoyingly" (p. 107). Some of the author's statements of fact are not quite correct. Kaunitz did *not* study at the universities of Vienna and Leyden (p. 185); General Traun was not a Hungarian (pp. 149, 151) nor General Daun a Bohemian (p. 209), both being Germans; Maria Theresa, after her husband's death, did not transfer "many of the burdens of state" to Joseph (p. 285), but only some, such as the army. Dr. Mahan's ignorance of Frederick's tireless activities and extraordinary achievements leads to the amazing statement that while the "smug and selfish" Prussian was "lording it over his little bigoted court of male *litterati*," Maria Theresa "reeled off more hard work than the King of Prussia ever did in an equal length of time" (p. 233).

Generally, Mahan's Maria Theresa moves in an economic vacuum. We are told all about the empress-queen's children, and how she loved and was faithful to her handsome and faithless husband; but little about the fearful

conditions of the masses, the feudalism, the greed and struggle for power on the part of church and nobility, the famines and epidemics, the crushing burden of taxation which made the embittered and wretched Viennese stone Maria Theresa's funeral. Dr. Mahan's chapter on the Polish partition, which he believes was a very naughty act, especially on the part of his heroine, is a misinterpretation from first to last. He thinks that Maria Theresa partitioned Poland because she had contacts with the bad Frederick. "The good girl," he writes, "went wrong because she played with a bad boy." One is tempted to paraphrase this by saying something about a good physician who went wrong because he played with a bad, bad subject.

S. K. PADOVER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Bohemia in the eighteenth century: a study in political, economic, and social history with special reference to the reign of Leopold II, 1790-1792.* By ROBERT JOSEPH KERNER, professor of modern European history, University of California. New York: Macmillan Co., 1932. Pp. xii+412. \$4.00.

Professor Kerner is one of the few American scholars who know the Czech language, and has chosen a period that is very important for the historian of Central Europe. While the French Revolution was spreading terror throughout Europe, the reign of Leopold II of Austria (1790-92), to which the author is chiefly attentive, was characterized by the clash of modern and medieval, centralizing and decentralizing, denationalizing and nationalizing, forces, which were intertwined with the determined opposition of the Czech nation as a whole to the Germanizing tendencies of Vienna. To this period are to be traced the roots of the Czech national revival that bore fruit in the eventual formation of the Czechoslovak republic.

The estates of Central Europe at this time demanded many changes, and after the manner of the French in their *cahiers*, presented their *desideria*, which have provided the foundation of the author's study regarding the then existing conditions, the functioning of government, the character and plans of the estates, and contemporary public opinion. The information derived from these sources is well digested, balanced, and intensive. We get a picture, on the one hand, of the estates aiming to restore the old order and opposing the economic and social reforms of Maria Theresa and Joseph II, while, on the other hand, these reforms were favored by the mass of the Bohemian population, though it was opposed to the Germanizing tendencies of Vienna. But since the estates—and even the members of the same estate—fought among themselves and the serf was won to the side of the government by its reforming policy, there was no revolution in Austria as in France. The Bohemian estates demanded a new constitution, such as had existed in the sixteenth cen-



ture; and yet they did not ask for the repeal of the centralizing measures of Maria Theresa, failing to see the contradiction in these two totally different attitudes. The government of Leopold II restored to the estates the constitution which was in effect in 1764, that is, after the great reforms of Maria Theresa. In the matter of economic changes, the Bohemian estates, except on the question of serfdom, took a position which was more liberal, especially on the question of tariff policy. The stand of the estates on taxation is interesting; they pointed out that Bohemia, besides paying its own enormous quota, was paying the taxes of other provinces by an amount annually of more than a half-million florins. A solution was found, but it was at the expense of the serf—as in the past. Moreover, the desire of the estates to impose more obligations on the serf received the support of the government after 1792, a support refused in 1775 but granted again out of fear of the French Revolution. Though Joseph's patent for religious toleration for Bohemia was saved by Leopold II, a halt was called upon further attacks on religion.

In 1790, it is to be noted, two forces met; one which resulted in making Bohemia officially German, the other which was reawakening the Czech national spirit. The estates, and notably the clergy, asked for the restoration of Latin and Czech in certain schools, the clergy being afraid that further Germanization would make the Bohemians more and more atheistic. The check imposed by these demands on further official Germanization was another strong impetus for the Czech national revival. Another effective step in this direction was the restoration of some of Bohemia's constitutional rights. Thus the ground was laid for further historical changes; after 1792 Bohemia was no longer wholly absolute in form of government nor officially German. Henceforth, it had at least the semblance of a constitution, and as time went on it became more and more bilingual.

This book is much more than its title would suggest; it is an admirable introduction to the whole story of Austria-Hungary and Central Europe. Written with great academic skill, it is a swift, readable, and judicious narrative, based almost entirely on original documents in the archives of Prague and Vienna, although the secondary material in various languages has also been fully digested and is referred to throughout the volume. Some parts will no doubt be contested by Czech scholars; for example, Svátek's history of the Czechoslovak Freemasonic movement (p. 315) is now doubted. Occasionally the Czech spelling needs minor corrections.

Even Czechoslovak historical scholarship is under obligations to the author for this volume, for it limits itself, with few exceptions, to political and cultural studies. Mr. Kerner approaches his subject not only from the political but also from the economic and social points of view, and there is an able and informative chapter on the judicial system and law.

The critical classified bibliography of 31 pages, chiefly of Czech and Ger-

man titles, is of great value. The author has first-hand knowledge and unusual insight into what is puzzling to most historians; he is to be congratulated on producing so serviceable a work.

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

CENTENARY JUNIOR COLLEGE  
HACKETTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY

*Sir George Otto Trevelyan: a memoir.* By his son, GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1932. Pp. x+213. \$4.00.

Sir George Otto Trevelyan won his first literary successes as a Cambridge undergraduate before the American Civil War broke out. He lived to write letters to Theodore Roosevelt and others on the conduct of the Great War. Belonging to a generation of Middle Victorians, he represented a type that flourished most in the reign of Queen Victoria, the literary man who was also a politician and a historian.

Active under Gladstone's leadership from 1868 on, he played an important part in the abolition of purchase in the army, in the extension of competitive examinations, a movement which had interested his father, in the wider bestowal of the franchise in county constituencies, and in the administration of Irish and Scottish affairs. During the years of opposition from 1874 to 1880 he produced the *Life of Macaulay* and the *Early history of Charles James Fox*; the *American Revolution* he wrote after final retirement from politics.

This memoir, written by the son on the career of the father, is charmingly done. A few judgments, perhaps will lead to questions: for instance, were the tactics of Gladstone in dealing with the abolition of purchase in the army "brilliant" (p. 89)? And again, was the Eastern question merely a matter of nationality to Gladstone, as is implied (p. 98), or, rather, also a religious question? However, as an interpretation of his father's life—the important object to the author—the book excels. And as the father could adapt his artistry to the portraiture of a great literary figure or to a portrayal of eighteenth-century society, so here is aptly depicted his own individuality and also the classical and literary culture of his age.

JOSEPH H. PARK

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

*Herder and the foundations of German nationalism.* By ROBERT REINHOLD ERGANG, PH.D. ("Studies in history, economics and public law," edited by the faculty of political science of Columbia University, No. 341.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1931. Pp. 288. \$4.50.

Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* exerted a wider influence on Germany and the rest of Europe than any other book written in

the German language during the eighteenth century. From no other German author did there issue so rich a flow of stimulating ideas on nationality and history. Herder pointed the way out of the fog of metaphysical abstractions to the study of the concrete life of peoples, the origin of language, mythology, poetry, and the historical roots of national cultures. Czechs, Southern Slavs, Magyars, the peoples of Romance Europe, not to mention the Germans themselves, found in this essay a stimulating appeal to an awakened consciousness of their national cultural heritage. Yet in all the vast literature on this intellectual father of nineteenth-century Germany there is surprisingly little by way of systematic critical analysis of his doctrine of nationality. Friedrich Meinecke in his brilliant essay on German nationalism omitted Herder from his discussion for reasons of his own. Meanwhile, monographs have appeared on Humboldt, Arndt, Jahn, and Fichte, but, strangely enough, none on Herder that deals with this aspect of his influence. Dr. Ergang's volume aims at filling this lacuna.

Regarding the volume, for the moment, simply as a collection of materials, it should be stated that the study is admirable, useful, and exhaustive. Opening with an extended description of the political structure of eighteenth-century Germany and the cosmopolitanism of its principal literary figures, the author proceeds to an analysis of Herder's doctrine of nationality which in a subsequent chapter is applied to the case of Germany; this is followed by a series of chapters dealing with Herder's doctrine on national language, literature, and history; a final chapter on Herder the nationalist concludes the study. Throughout the author reveals not merely an intimate and scholarly acquaintance with Herder but with the large philosophical and critical literature that has accumulated around him. The book is backed with significant material, and there is a reasonable presumption that the reader will find in it almost everything for which he has a right to seek.

Yet the reviewer cannot suppress certain doubts as to the sufficiency of the method employed. This method is expository rather than reflective, critical, and analytical. Herder is treated with a reverence which today he no longer deserves. The author's conclusion that Herder's nationalism was cultural rather than political might have forewarned him against casting his entire study into a political mold. We are given no careful scrutiny of the manner in which Herder arrived at his concept of nationality, nor is this thought related to what other contemporaries, notably Voltaire and Montesquieu, said on the same subject. It must be admitted that Herder, in spite of his profound insight, still operated with a faulty historical method and that he failed to throw on the screen a clear picture of the forces which co-operate in producing cultural values within a nation. Nor, what is more important, did Herder offer an adequate solution of the problem of the relation between culture and the nation. To be sure, he approached it once in his consideration of Greek literature when he pointed out that this literature must be studied not as an isolated phenomenon but in relation to the fulness of Greek social,

intellectual, and political life. Had Herder gone the whole way and considered in this spirit the origin and development of all cultural phenomena and related them to a national experience, culture and nationality would have become in his hands more of a living unit. As it was, Herder somehow never squarely faced the problem. It is regrettable that such fruitful critical observations as these find no place in Dr. Ergang's volume. A trenchant criticism he might have found in Moritz Ritter's brilliant article on Herder published in the *Historische Zeitschrift* more than fifteen years ago. But this article seems to have escaped Dr. Ergang's notice.

WALTER L. DORN

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

---

*The diplomatic relations of the United States with the Barbary powers, 1776-1816.* By RAY W. IRWIN. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1931. Pp. 225. \$3.00.

In this detailed account of American diplomatic relations with the Barbary powers Mr. Irwin has aimed "to place sufficient emphasis upon the commercial, naval, and military aspects to explain significant diplomatic phenomena," and to throw "additional light upon European attitudes towards American relations with Morocco, Algiers, Tunis and Tripoli." He has not only been the first writer systematically to exploit the unprinted material on the subject in the archives of the department of state, but he has examined the papers of Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Edward Preble in the Library of Congress, the Timothy Pickering papers at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the correspondence of James Leander Cathcart in the New York Public Library, as well as various printed sources. Despite this painstaking research, the synthesis is disappointing. Although the specialist can glean some new details from this rather uninspired account, the general student of American diplomacy will find a more suggestive, stimulating, and helpful account in Gardner Weld Allen's *Our navy and the Barbary corsairs*.

Mr. Irwin's researches did not lead him into the archives of the European powers, where much might be found to throw light on their relations to the American negotiations with the Barbary states. Short of this, something more might have been done with the French side of the problem had he used the work of Deslandres, *L'ordre des Trinitaires pour le rachat des captifs*. As he harps from time to time on the old theme of British interest in the pirates as a check on their commercial rivals, it seems unfortunate that his careful investigations did not extend to British archival material.

Mr. Irwin concludes that the payment of \$60,000 ransom stipulated in the Treaty of 1805 with Tripoli was unwise, on the ground that the concentration of the whole force at Commodore Rodgers' disposal within gunshot of the Pasha's castle would have caused him "to release the prisoners in all haste." He believes that the evidence sustaining the view that Yusuf would have exe-

cuted his prisoners in case he became hard pressed is no stronger than the evidence in support of the opposite conclusion. "If it be granted for argument's sake that the threat would have been carried out, one may still be permitted to wonder whether Bainbridge and his fellows could have died in a nobler cause" (pp. 157-58).

A number of the documents cited from manuscript sources, including a dozen letters from Jefferson and John Adams, have already been published. The bibliography omits the writings of Mordecai M. Noah, Paullin's *Commodore John Rodgers*, and the "Hull-Eaton Correspondence during the Expedition against Tripoli," which Charles Henry Lincoln contributed to the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society for April, 1911.

JAMES P. BAXTER, 3RD

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*The French Revolution.* By PIERRE GAXOTTE. Translated with an introduction by WALTER ALISON PHILLIPS, LITT.D., Lecky professor of modern history in the University of Dublin. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. Pp. xiv+416. \$3.00.

This book should bring some comfort to those who hold to the old belief that history is more interesting than fiction. The publishers of the English translation state that eighty-four editions of the book were distributed in Europe after the first French edition appeared in 1928. While no accurate figures are available, the supposition must be that over 100,000 copies were sold, for even if the early editions were small, the later ones would grow as the demand increased. Such a record may well be the envy of those who aspire to write fiction "best-sellers." Of course those who disapprove of much that M. Gaxotte writes might counter by claiming that there is plenty of fiction in his work as it stands. But whether the French agree with his view of the Revolution or not, one point is clear—they like to read it.

The thesis of the book is perhaps best shown by a short quotation.

The seventeenth century had been an age in which the French genius reached its full bloom. The aspect under which men at that time liked to conceive of man was that of a being alive to realities and prone to reflexion, who curbs his appetites and his passions in obedience to a higher rule of order and harmony. Such a man distrusts individual caprice. . . . Knowing his own weaknesses, he does not take his own desires as the basis of morality and knowledge. . . . The tragedy of the eighteenth century lies, indeed, not in its wars nor the "days" (*journées*) of the Revolution, but in the dissolution and reversal of the ideas which had illumined and dominated the seventeenth. Riots and massacres were but the bloody and signal expression of this fact; for, long before these happened, the real harm had already been done.

This last observation is of course only a paraphrase of the more famous statement of Chateaubriand that "the Revolution was accomplished before it occurred." Emphasizing the superiority of the seventeenth century over

the eighteenth is also harking back to the view which became popular some fifty or sixty years ago and was largely due to the defeat of France by the Germans in 1870. M. Gaxotte writes, however, with refreshing deftness and charm. Eschewing the labor of handling musty records himself, he yet adapts the results of the best and most recent scholarship to meet the needs of his particular view. The present French government as an outgrowth of the Revolution often serves as the target for his shafts, as, for example, when he writes (referring to the old régime), "Money was squandered on the courtiers just as nowadays it is squandered on the electors." And again, "The way in which monarchical France had been formed bit by bit out of the ruins of feudal France gave the royal power, though theoretically unlimited, a character and limitations which we Frenchmen as citizens of a bureaucratic, Napoleonic and half-socialized State find it difficult to understand."

Declaring that there was no adequate reason for the hatred which the peasants bore to their lords before the Revolution, he adds: "Generally speaking, the squires were not bad fellows. As dirty and mud-stained as their farmers, they retained hardly anything of their lordly estate save a genealogical tree, a dove-cote, a sporting dog and an old rusty sword." This may be clever but it will hardly pass for a fair statement of the case. The serious character of the agrarian troubles that developed with the outbreak of the Revolution and the general rising of the peasants against the manorial system seem to indicate quite clearly that these gentlemen were not as harmless as he would have us believe.

It is evident that M. Gaxotte approves of neither the doctrines, the methods, nor the results of the Revolution. Contending that the two great problems before France—the abolition of the relics of feudalism and financial reform—could have been solved without resort to revolution, he considers the movement quite unjustifiable. Consequently he devotes the major portion of his work to those aspects of it (and there are plenty of them) which show it at its worst. To him it is only destructive, and how could it be otherwise when he believes that it destroyed genius in "full bloom"? This attitude on the part of the author has a marked effect upon his work as a whole. M. Gaxotte is never dull, and his selection of material has added greatly to the popular interest, if not to the balance, of his book. Constructive work is a difficult, laborious process, and when it is extended over a considerable period of time it ceases to stir the imagination. Destruction, on the other hand, may be sudden and spectacular, while extremes and excesses are usually most sensational of all. Such affairs captivate the interest and may arouse the imagination to a much higher pitch than their real significance justifies. Without attempting to demonstrate my belief that the Revolution has a most important constructive side, I merely quote the words of Professor H. J. Laski regarding those fomenters of revolution, the *philosophes*. "They released those permanent forces of the human spirit which lead men to seek for the realization of

their best selves. Whatever their demerits, that, in the end, is an unperishable service."

The translation by Professor Phillips is on the whole well done, but a few errors slipped by him. On page 118 the translated word "resurrection" should be "insurrection" or "rising." The translator might also have called the author's attention to the following apparent contradiction: "On the 27th [of June], Necker having resigned" (p. 98); "On the 11th [of July] Necker was dismissed" (p. 102). The latter statement is correct.

GEORGE GORDON ANDREWS

STATE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

---

*Propyläen-Weltgeschichte*. Edited by WALTER GOETZ, professor in the University of Leipzig. Vol. VII, *Die französische Revolution, Napoleon, und die Restauration, 1789-1848*. Prepared by ALFRED STERN, FRANZ SCHNABEL, OSKAR WALZEL, HEINRICH HERKNER, FRIEDRICH LUCKWALDT. Berlin: Propyläen-Verlag, 1929. Pp. xxiv + 599. Rm. 30.60.

The series to which the work under review belongs bears the subtitle, "Der Werdegang der Menschheit in Gesellschaft und Staat, Wirtschaft und Geistesleben." This particular volume purports to trace the social, political, economic, and intellectual development of humanity in Europe from the outbreak of the French Revolution to the eve of the Revolution of 1848. The five professors collaborating in the preparation of the work, however, have merely begun and stopped at the terminal dates. They have failed to portray these years as a historical period.

An outstanding feature of the volume is its format. It is well bound, clearly printed, and profusely illustrated with timely reproductions of contemporary prints and etchings and historical paintings and documents that throw an illuminating light on the accompanying text. The book is also provided with a good table of contents, an apparently adequate index, and a useful time chart that gives in four columns and in chronological order the principal developments in the domestic history of the different states, diplomatic relations, the social and economic life, and the intellectual life. These features make the volume a delight to the lover of fine books and useful to the student just beginning to read history in a foreign tongue.

The text of the work is divided into a short introduction on the intellectual foundations of the nineteenth century and five parts, each by one of the collaborating authors. The first of these, the work of Alfred Stern, deals with the French Revolution and its effect on Europe. In the main it is a conventional account of the more obvious events of the years between 1789 and 1799, which gives rather scant attention to the effect of the revolutionary movement on the countries surrounding France. The second part covers the period from

1799 to 1815. Here again the emphasis is on political, diplomatic, and military events rather than on the far more important temporary or permanent introduction of the revolutionary conditions and institutions and the awakening or accelerating of liberal and national movements. The next two sections of the work on "Classicism and romanticism as European phenomena" and "The social and economic movements from the middle of the eighteenth to the second half of the nineteenth century" are fresh, invigorating discussions that help to justify the subtitle of the series. The final part gives a conventional picture of the period from 1815 to the eve of the Revolution of 1848. On the whole, therefore, the volume would seem to indicate that the *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* is destined to take a respectable position in the category of general, universal, and world-histories and histories of humanity.

C. P. HIGBY

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

---

*Bibliografía de Albert Mathiez.* By RICARDO R. CAILLET-BOIS, profesor de historia argentina y suplente de historia americana y de historia de la civilización moderna, en las Universidades de Buenos Aires y La Plata. From the *Boletín del Instituto de investigaciones históricas*, Vol. XIV (1932). Buenos Aires: Imprenta de la Universidad, 1932. Pp. 191.

In 1898, Mathiez published the first instalment of his "Étude critique sur les journées des 5 et 6 octobre 1789" in the *Revue historique* (LXVII, 258-94); his work still continues to appear posthumously in the *Annales historiques de la Révolution française*. In less than thirty-five years of active production, Mathiez had published enough books, articles, and reviews to require 181 pages (the first 10 pages of this book being introductory) to list bibliographically with occasional comment on some of them. There are 26 titles under the subdivision "Obras," including one work of two volumes, another of three, and a third which was an editorial task of eight (the re-edition of Jaurès's *Histoire socialiste de la Révolution française* in 1922-24). Under the subdivision "Opúsculos" there are mentioned seven works, varying in size from 22 to 90 pages in length. There are 474 titles under "Artículos," many of them only a page or less in size, but some long and significant. The bibliographer has not indicated, but it is nevertheless important to note that many of these articles are reprinted in several of the books, which are therefore not separate studies but only reprints. The articles were published chiefly in Mathiez's own journals; but other outstanding French periodicals are liberally represented, as well as some foreign reviews.

There are 600 reviews, representing more than that many books (since a review may sometimes consider several books at the same time), under the subdivision "Juicios bibliográficos." Sr. Caillet-Bois has arranged these in the alphabetical order of their authors' names, so that one is tempted to derive



from the list some idea of the relative importance to Mathiez of recent historians of the French Revolution. Aulard (whose important work was done before Mathiez began reviewing extensively) is represented by five titles; Caron by four; Cochin by four; Chuquet (likewise relatively inactive during Mathiez's mature years) by three; Debidour by four; Dommanget by five; Driault by four; Dubreuil by seven; Gain by four; Lacombe by three; Lacour-Gayet by three; Lanzac de Laborie by three; Lefebvre by four; Madelin by four; Marion by seven; Gaston-Martin by seven; Michon by three; Pisani by three; Porée by six; Poulet by five; Poupé by three; Pouthas by three; Renouvin by three; Sée by thirteen; Sévestre by four; Stenger by four; Tarlé by three; Uzureau by five; Vermale by six; Weill by six. The bibliographer has never taken the trouble to enter more than once any title by more than one author; otherwise, both Sagnac and Guyot would be credited with more than one of Mathiez's reviews. While interesting for the light it sheds on Mathiez' amazing industry, the list of his *comptes-rendus*, however, probably reveals only what was sent to him for review rather than any large discretion on his part. One finds among them books on many fields quite remote from the French Revolution. For that matter, it comes somewhat as a shock to discover that Mathiez wrote a history of *Les États-Unis au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle*.

LOUIS GOTTSCHALK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*The struggle for land in Ireland, 1800-1923.* By JOHN E. POMFRET, assistant professor of history, Princeton University. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1930. Pp. xiv+334. \$3.00.

The first chapter of this volume, covering the years from 1800 to 1850, is essentially an introduction to the problem: the Irish peasants, rapidly increasing in numbers, were determined to hold the land as their only means of subsistence, while the landlords, confronted with diminishing rent rolls because of the lower price of corn, were equally determined to drive the tenantry from the soil in order to convert tillage to pasture. The study proper really begins with 1850, and the history of the struggle for land in Ireland from that year until 1923 may be divided, it seems, into four more or less distinct periods.

The first of these, from 1850 to 1870, was one in which the British government sought to force upon Ireland a system of *laissez faire* in land. Landlords were conceded the absolute right to dispose of their property as they pleased. Outside of Ulster, where landlords in general continued to accept the presumption that tenant right was just and reasonable, the Irish peasant's time-honored notions of tenant right were destroyed and he himself was subjected to the "withdrawal of customary privileges, the ceaseless demand for higher rents, the perennial notice to quit and the cruel eviction." The second period, from 1870 to 1881, saw, on the one hand, widespread agitation in Ireland

against the existing land system, accompanied by the rapid rise of the Irish nationalist movement, and, on the other hand, various efforts on the part of the British government to remedy the situation. In Gladstone's Act of 1870 the government "abandoned its *laissez-faire* hypothesis in regard to land" and "rejected the landlords' doctrine of an absolute and infallible right of property in land." Unfortunately, the act failed of its main purpose—the prevention of arbitrary and unjust eviction—because selfish landlords were quick to discover and avail themselves of "huge loopholes" in it. The Act of 1881 with its adoption of the three F's, however, finally safeguarded the Irish tenants' right to remain upon the land, subject only to a "fair" rent, and his right to dispose of his interest in the holding. This act openly admitted the principle of "dual ownership."

The third period, from 1881 to 1903, was one in which the system of dual ownership prevailed, and in which it "proved to be unsound economically as well as socially." Although the adoption of this principle was a "triumph for Irish peasantry," the latter remained discontented. They wanted the land. The landlords were even more dissatisfied, for they soon discovered that "fair" rents resulted in lower rents, and that lower rents, in the face of an organized peasantry, were just as difficult to collect as high rents. Dual ownership broke the landlords financially. For them it brought "a régime of Force, Fraud and Folly." From this intolerable situation they were ultimately enabled to retire with a minimum of loss when the Conservative party enacted a series of land-purchase acts. The fourth and concluding period of the struggle for land in Ireland covered the two decades from 1903 to 1923. Although the principle of land purchase by means of state aid was adopted in the closing years of the nineteenth century, the triumph of that principle came only with the passage of the great Purchase Act of 1903. During the early years of the twentieth century Irish tenants gradually became owners of their holdings. Whereas in 1870 there had been some 600,000 Irish tenant occupiers, the year 1922 saw only 70,000 holdings as yet unpurchased by their occupiers. After the establishment of the Irish Free State the latter enacted a sweeping agrarian law compelling landlords to sell their estates and tenants to purchase their holdings. Northern Ireland took a similar step, and thus the year 1923 saw "the solution of the most difficult problem perhaps in Irish history."

This scholarly study, an expansion of a doctoral dissertation, provides an excellent and impartial account of the transformation of the Irish land system from one of tenancy at will into one of ownership in freehold. It provides, too, an admirable background for an understanding of the conflict over land payments at present being waged between the Irish Free State and the British government. The author has told his story skilfully, in language which is straightforward and clear. He has provided his readers, furthermore, with adequate documentation, bibliography, and index.

F. LEE BENNS

*The stream of time: social and domestic life in England, 1805-1861.*

By MRS. C. S. PEEL, O.B.E. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. Pp. xix+265. \$4.00.

Mrs. C. S. Peel, in addition to numerous activities as an editor, in war work and in other fields of public service, has been a busy maker of books—novels, cookbooks, and semihistorical works. The present volume is one of the latter. Its main title is an extract from one of the letters of that gifted and beautiful but unfortunate granddaughter of Sheridan—Mrs. Caroline Norton. Mrs. Peel perhaps best describes her own work. She writes:

This book is neither a history nor a novel: it is the record of an imaginary family based upon history, fiction and the letters, papers and portraits of real people.

The members of the London family met a number of celebrated persons and took part in some important events. We learn how they lived, ate, dressed, travelled, thought, worked and amused themselves during a particularly interesting period of England's history, that is, while the glorious squalors of the Georgian era were giving place to the ugliness, the respectability and the humanitarianism of the Mid-Victorian age.

A production of this sort cannot fairly be judged by the strictest standards of historical scholarship. It alternates the grave and the gay. Dark pictures of the life of the poor in the fields, the slums, the factories, and the mines are lightened by various sprightly trifles relating to the doings of the upper classes, the nobility, and even of the royal family. In this connection it should be pointed out that the author is not dazzled by the glamor of great names. Moreover, there are welcome touches of humor, and although there are rather breathless dashes from one topic to another it is possible from these pages to pick up considerable miscellaneous information and to obtain a reasonable, adequate view of the era without excessive mental effort. Possibly there is overmuch on household appointments and female dress for the taste of most male readers.

Even though designed as a popular work, a few details may be questioned. A quotation opposite the title-page appears thus: "Rev. William Stubbs, 1825, 'Constitutional History of England.'" It should be stated that 1825 was the year of the bishop's death. The difference between the school systems of Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell are left a bit vague (p. 40). By a curious slip (p. 71) Lady Cowper is referred to as Palmerston's sister. On page 75 we are told that "Old Q," the fourth Duke of Queensbury, was the original of Thackeray's Marquis of Steyne: it is generally agreed that the third Marquis of Hertford furnished the model for the unedifying character as well as for Disraeli's Lord Monmouth. The £20,000,000 appropriated to compensate the slaveowners (p. 108) was not confined to the West Indies, and the inadequacy of their share aroused not a little bitterness among the Boers in South Africa. The brief allusion to the queen's celebrated memorandum to Palmerston (p. 231) puts her demand in a somewhat misleading light. The informal

bibliography (p. 250), though not extensive, is, on the whole, well selected, though Mr. A. E. Fremantle's two volumes, *England in the nineteenth century*, invaluable for its description of social and economic conditions during the decade from 1801 to 1810, might well have been included, and also Sir Sidney Lee's *Queen Victoria*, which Mrs. Peel seems to have read.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ARTHUR LYON CROSS

---

*Metternich*. By ARTHUR HERMAN. New York: Century Co., 1932.  
Pp. 370. \$5.00.

Since the publication of my work on Metternich, two persons of the Anglo-Saxon literary world have concerned themselves with the thought and work of this European and Austrian statesman. Their relation to my book, from which they both start, is very different. The Oxford historian, E. L. Woodward, in his work, *Three studies in European conservatism*, has devoted some hundred pages of vigorous essay to Metternich, which are a careful and scientific piece of work. While the author rejects Bibl's polemic against my own views and says only that I take Metternich's philosophy "a little too seriously," he himself, on the basis of published sources which he has worked through, ascribes to Metternich certain fundamental European views, and likewise in his estimate of Metternich's personality and his activity presents much the same view as I myself do, even if he, as an Englishman, naturally has in many ways a different outlook from a German Central European and an Austrian.

It is much more difficult for me to write of the work of the American, Arthur Herman. In this case, it is not as if a scientific historian had used the work of another and on the basis of his own study of the sources had tried to produce an independent picture of the same object; but rather a man who is not a historian has, without any independent research worth mentioning, shortened the work of a historian, has taken the other's work almost step for step, and changed it about into a smaller and more easily read presentation. He has not, however, given any sufficient indication to his public of the basis on which his work, from the first to almost the last page, rests.

In the course of the last years negotiations have gone on between me, my German publisher, and representatives of foreign firms who wished translations of my work on Metternich. These negotiations have always failed because the foreign publishers wished to have my two-volume work of some fourteen hundred pages shortened to a usable edition of one volume and then translated. For lack of time and inclination I could not decide to make this radical change. The task which I shunned an American, Mr. Herman, has now undertaken *without my knowledge*. It is certainly not worthy of imitation that the author of a popular work should not acknowledge in the most obvious place the source which he follows throughout in intellectual dependence

upon it. Mr. Herman has mentioned my work in a very obscure place in his last chapter entitled "Retrospect" (p. 356), and with praise. I am informed that the original manuscript contained a long section on "Metternich biographies and essays" which had the following:

Of biographies incomparably the finest, and one which at the same time may stand as a virtual history of Austria from 1800 to 1848, is the two volume work by Professor Heinrich von Srbik of the University of Vienna, *Metternich, der Staatsmann und der Mensch*, Munich, 1925. The present writer wishes to acknowledge here his incalculable indebtedness to this masterful and monumental study. Massive in scope, rich in new archival material, and profound in treatment, it is indispensable for any serious student of Metternich.

Unfortunately the English publisher advised the greatest possible condensation, so that only a small part of Herman's intended acknowledgment remained, and this left no true understanding of the content. In wide circles in America and England, Mr. Herman's book will be regarded as *the* Metternich biography, as the extensive notice in the *Times Literary Supplement*, April 28, 1932, already shows. Mr. Herman, a man who, according to the jacket of the English edition, has studied at Harvard and Yale as well as in Vienna and Jena, who calls Vienna his "Lieblingsstadt," who is apparently artistically a man of many parts, might learn this lesson for his future work as a biographer—that one mentions on the title-page or in the foreword a work from which one has drawn, in the large and in detail, one's material, even when one is a popular historian.

Since Mr. Herman has informed me that he considers his book an independent work and as proof cites the fact that he does not believe in a Metternich "system," a few lines may be devoted to this "proof." On page 110 Herman says that Metternich did not always act realistically, but sometimes academically as a theorist of the eighteenth century, yes, even as a dogmatist. Cf. also pages 171 ("the dogmatist") and 234 ("the true doctrinaire") or page 223 ("As always, he thought first as an European, then as an Austrian, and only finally as a German"); or page 349 ("an empiricist. . . . Yet with his powerful urge toward the abstract he placed empiricism or induction as the second step, after deduction had laid the foundations"); or pages 360-61 (denying to Metternich a system only in the sense of "a systematic technique of political realism," but recognition of "a set of deductive principles derived *a priori* through his reason"). This is Herman's proof.

I can only repeat that his work in its line of thought and in the exposition of details is an abbreviation of my own book. Numerous quotations from sources which Herman himself has not read at all, as his poverty-stricken bibliography shows, are borrowed word for word; the newer scientific works since 1925, with the exception of the books by Bibl and Woodward, which for the rest have had no noticeable influence, are not even used. Herman's work differs from its source only in the following: In some places the author makes, on

the basis of the papers of Metternich or of the letters to the Princess Lieven (ed. Jean Hanoteau; Paris, 1909) or *Life, letters and journals of George Ticknor* (Boston, 1876) a broader portrayal without saying anything new. "The man" and "The historical figure" are considered in conclusion rather than, as I have done it, at the beginning and in the middle; the positive evaluation of Metternich exceeds my own estimate; the shortened form often brings with it a simplification and a coarsening. Even the heading of the chapter "Spectator" is like that of my section "Der Beobachter in der Loge."

The form of the whole book is truly pleasant, lively, often plastic. Therein lies the author's talent. For the German and for the historian who uses German his work is superfluous. Superfluous also, of course, is a shortened edition of my Metternich work from my own pen, since Herman has felt himself called to this task.

HEINRICH RITTER VON SRBIK

VIENNA

*Norwegian migration to America, 1825-1860.* By THEODORE C.

BLEGEN, associate professor of history in the University of Minnesota and assistant superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society. Northfield, Minn.: Norwegian-American Historical Association, 1931. Pp. xi+413. \$3.50.

What Professor George M. Stephenson of the University of Minnesota has for many years been doing in the field of Swedish immigration finds its counterpart in the field of Norwegian immigration in the work of his colleague, Professor Blegen. The book under review is, moreover, a striking example of what must be done for all so-called foreign stocks, which have settled in these United States, before it will be possible to acquire a comprehensive understanding of the many factors that have entered into the development of present-day America.

As indicated in the title-page Mr. Blegen's work deals with the earlier phase of the Norwegian migration to America, ending with the outbreak of the Civil War. Considerable space has been allotted to the development of the background of the movement, and, what is quite unique in studies of this kind, attention has been paid to the reaction of the migration upon society in the mother-country. The so-called "America-letters" and emigrant ballads and songs lend color to the story, and, as the author says in his preface, "swing wide the door to the realization that immigrants are people, not lines in a graph or figures in a table."

Much of the material Mr. Blegen secured in Norway during his studies there as a fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation. The book, however, represents researches conducted in many places in America as well. It comprises sixteen chapters, three appendixes, and a full index, and in addition is provided with seventeen illustrations and maps.

GEORGE H. RYDEN

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

*Studies in diplomatic history.* By SIR JAMES HEADLAM-MORLEY, C.B.E., formerly fellow of King's College, Cambridge, late historical adviser to the foreign office. New York: Alfred H. King, 1930. Pp. vii+312. \$3.75.

The nine essays included in this volume were written during the ten years preceding its publication while the author was the historical adviser to the British foreign office. In his own words:

The subject was in each case suggested by some political event or diplomatic problem of the moment; now it was the necessity, at the Congress of Lausanne, of coming to some new arrangement regarding the *régime* of the Straits which for over a hundred years had furnished one of the main problems of European diplomacy; now it was the suggestions which were put forward from time to time to complete that guarantee to France which had been promised in the Treaty of Versailles, but which in fact had not been carried out; . . .

The chief interest of the volume lies, therefore, in the fact that it furnishes examples of the type of historical information used by the staff of the foreign office as a preparation when highly important negotiations are to be undertaken. No attempt, as the author confesses, is made to do more than sketch the main outline of the problems under consideration. In each case the chief object has been to make clear the origins, the development, and even the justification for British policy with reference to some specific problem.

As an example we may consider the essay on "Proposals for the reduction of armaments." Beginning with the well-known proposal of the Tsar Alexander in 1816, there follows a brief survey of the official attempts during the next century to bring about a reduction of armaments. The least known of such suggestions was made by Napoleon III, who in 1868 sought, through London, to reach an agreement with Bismarck. The danger to Great Britain inherent in such a proposal, which was not perceived by Lord Clarendon, is revealed by Headlam-Morley's remark that the foreign minister of that day "was really advising a course of action which must inevitably have led to an agreement between them for a partition of Belgium, and as a necessary result of this a coalition for a war against England." Further examination reveals that in every case when it was proposed to reduce armaments, the intention was to score immediate success in policy rather than to take a first step in general disarmament. But we need go no farther. If one desires additional information on the present prospects of relief from Geneva, he could do no better than read this essay.

As might be expected from one so intimately connected with the foreign office, good use is made of its archives. That few revelations are made is due to no failure to utilize the materials, but rather to the fact that details of British foreign policy had been more freely published for this period than was the case with other European powers.

DAWSON PHELPS

*Bismarck und die Grundlegung der deutschen Grossmacht.* By EGMONT ZECHLIN. Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1930. Pp. xiii+630. Rm. 17.50.

This is a detailed account of the European, German, and Prussian situations at the time when Bismarck began his ministry, and of the way in which those situations and Bismarck's policy developed during the first year of that ministry. The scope of the book was determined by the conditions of its origin. The author intended to write the constitutional history of Bismarckian Germany. In order to provide adequate background for his study of the genesis of the constitution, he began to re-examine the period of the "sixties" and found the existing works unsatisfactory. On the one hand, the course of events since 1914 demanded a new point of view and provided perspective; on the other hand, a flood of new material made it possible and necessary to supplement the older standard works. The original project gave way to the plan of a comprehensive presentation of Bismarck's policy in the period of the founding of the Empire. The book before us may be regarded as a first volume of this work.

The first chapter is a brilliant analysis of the unstable equilibrium which characterized the relations of the European powers in the late summer of 1862. A series of diagrammatic maps helps bring into clear relief the principal strains and stresses: the nationalities of the Habsburg monarchy; the points of conflict of England and Russia in the Near East and Asia, of England and France in the Mediterranean and Red seas; the national aspirations of the Poles; and "wasp-waisted" Prussia, set in a divided Germany between three great empires.

The second chapter is an analysis of Bismarck's personality and statecraft. In his years of preparation, he had drafted plans to meet many contingencies but he was never controlled by a system. Like all great strategists, he had mastered sound principles which he applied with brilliant and bewildering versatility. To single out for special emphasis any of the parts of Zechlin's penetrating and well-balanced discussion would be to distort its significance. Implicit in it all—a point that might have been more clearly emphasized—is the fact that it was the combination of Bismarck's qualities in a single individual which raised him so far above the Louis Napoleons, Rechbergs, and Gorchakovs whose limitations give the measure of his greatness.

In the account of the Prussian constitutional conflict and of the first year of Bismarck's ministry which fills the rest of the volume, Zechlin has made effective use of the printed materials and of the resources of the Prussian and Austrian archives. In some places the new documents are of unusual interest and importance. The protocols of the Prussian crown councils show that it was the king who insisted on the course of domestic policy that Bismarck was called on to carry through; Roon's influence in this respect has generally been overestimated. Letters of Queen Augusta, one of which is reproduced in fac-



simile, show the vigor and persistence of her opposition to the appointment of Bismarck.

The first three months of Bismarck's ministry, containing the skirmish with Austria over the proposed assembly of delegates, has usually been slighted. Zechlin does full justice to this episode, on which he throws new light from the Vienna archives. More open to difference of interpretation is his treatment of the Alvensleben Convention. On the basis of fresh study in the Prussian archives and of his general view of Bismarck, he defends the Prussian statesman against Lord's somewhat disparaging criticism (cf. *American historical review*, October, 1923). He is inclined to accept Bismarck's estimate of the strength of the pro-Polish party at the Russian court. In the arguments over the origin and proposed abandonment of the convention, Zechlin upholds Bismarck against the Russians. Indeed, in a mild way, Gorchakov appears as the villain of the piece. Zechlin recognizes, however, that the action of other powers was more important than the convention in averting the dreaded Franco-Russian alliance.

The discussion of the international situation in the spring and summer of 1863 is, in some respects, less satisfactory than the earlier portions of the book. It needs to be supplemented by a knowledge of the inner history of the English-French-Austrian coalition. Much of the necessary material from other archives has recently been published by Dr. Rudolf Ibbeken in Volume III of *Die Auswärtige Politik Preussens 1858-1871*. The book is illustrated with portraits and facsimiles. There is no formal bibliography and the index is only of persons.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

LAWRENCE D. STEEFEL

---

*Rural Russia under the old régime: a history of the landlord-peasant world and a prologue to the peasant revolution of 1917.* By GEROID TANQUARY ROBINSON. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1932. Pp. x+342. \$4.00.

In the present volume Professor Robinson offers an excellent and scholarly work in the form of a general survey chiefly of the problem of serfdom and its aftermath in connection with its relations to landholding designed as an introduction to his forthcoming history of the great agrarian revolution in Russia of 1917.

The author states (p. 2) that although "it is altogether too early as yet to attempt to appraise the *results*" of the revolution, "something may even now be done . . . toward the description and analysis of the *process*." Later on he writes (p. 137): ". . . The major attempt [in this account] has been to get *inside* the village,—and all this in the high hope of producing a history which would approach as near as may be to a factual accuracy, and perhaps would also convey some sense of the reality of life in the log houses of the forests and

the post-and-plaster houses of the *step*." It would seem to the reviewer that the author has had much more success in describing the process through which the revolution was born than in getting inside the village and that his chief contribution is a careful and cautious, as well as painstaking and sincere, analysis of numerous Russian monographs and governmental and institutional statistics bearing on this subject.

As is only natural, Mr. Robinson is at times obliged to touch briefly on many other topics, and he apologizes for thus distracting the reader. The fact is that he might never have arrived at his objective, the agrarian revolution of 1917, within the present volume, had he brought into his account in full all the ramifications of this subject in government and politics, in finance and taxation, in commerce and foreign relations, in industry and agriculture, and in philosophy and literature over a period of four or five centuries for a country of the size of Russia. The consequence is that we have the best survey in one volume of its kind from the origins of serfdom to 1917, with special emphasis on the period since 1861.

The text devotes four chapters to the time from the beginnings of serfdom to the emancipation of the serfs; the next four, to the subsequent epoch before the revolution of 1905; and the last four, to the time between the revolutions of 1905 and 1917. One-half of the volume is given over to the last eight chapters and indicates the emphasis. There is a large and carefully arranged system of footnotes and a splendid bibliography, chiefly of monographs in Russian and published collections of statistics and government documents of one sort or another. Two useful tables of statistics are appended.

Although a good deal that appears in the present volume may be found elsewhere, its chief advantage over others is its freshness of approach, objectivity, and systematic treatment. Throughout a laudable caution is observed—at times, even, when a conclusion or generalization would appear self-evident. A chapter devoted to a critical estimate of Russian research on the subject under investigation would have helped younger scholars who use Russian and who must necessarily depend upon a guide into the various streams of interpretations which the literature exhibits.

In the first four chapters the story concerns itself with the gradual evolution of serfdom, its solidification into a complete servile system by the end of the seventeenth century, if not sooner, its maintenance in the eighteenth century, and the conditions surrounding it before 1861. Here is to be seen the evolution, the flowering, and the decline of a large part of the medieval structure of society. A chapter is devoted to manorial economy during this period.

Without tracing the legislative history of emancipation the author proceeds to a thorough analysis of the way in which the serf was emancipated and of the confusing and often contradictory laws subsequently enacted, the result of which was that the peasant remained half-serf and half-free. Several chapters are devoted to the increasing land-hunger of the peasant and the sinking landlord on the eve of the revolution of 1905. This event is properly de-

scribed in terms of the agrarian stream of the revolt, from which the peasant emerged better off by virtue of economic and political concessions. The penultimate chapter contains an analysis of the new legislation, often called the Stolypin land laws, the chief object of which was to create a conservative landholding peasantry based on private property.

The last chapter, treating of a number of miscellaneous topics and leaving for later treatment the "war-time fortunes of the peasantry," ends with the following conclusion:

There was no mistaking the *trend* toward individual property and independent farming; yet in any attempt to judge the peasant temper, allowance must be made for the part played by official compulsion in producing this trend, and it must also be remembered that with the system of peasant holding and peasant cultivation still in a violent flux of change, there had been thus far only limited opportunity for the new ways to become habitual. Still it is possible that by reason of the economic and legal developments which have just been summarized, the likelihood of a general uprising of the peasants was diminishing.

ROBERT J. KERNER

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

---

*Kaiser und Kabinettschef*. Nach eigenen Aufzeichnungen und dem Briefwechsel des Wirklichen Geheimen Rats RUDOLF VON VALENTINI. Edited by BERNHARD SCHWERTFEGER. Oldenburg: Gerhard Stalling, 1931. Pp. 254. Rm. 8.

Valentini was of a Hessian family whose name, Velten, had retained the borrowed Latin form. He began his career in the Prussian administrative service, but in 1899 was appointed to the emperor's civil cabinet—which seems to have been recruited wholly from that service. In 1908, on the sudden death of Lucanus, he was made *Kabinettschef*; Bülow had fixed on another man, the emperor himself evidently chose Valentini. He remained in this post until driven out by Ludendorff in January, 1918, in the general process of isolating William II from all advisers not under Ludendorff's control. It thus fell to Valentini to take a hand in the transition from Bülow to Bethmann; he was intimately associated with the "highest quarters" during the next ten years; and during the war played an important part in most of the larger decisions faced by the emperor. Indirectly, his brief memoir also gives interesting light on the functions of a *Kabinettschef*. The three cabinets were necessarily self-effacing, and the contemporary public was never conscious of their rôle; but it is clear that their records will some day offer historical evidence of primary importance.

Herr Schwertfeger has published the unfinished and all too brief memoirs into which the author (after the war) recast his rough diary. There is a gap for the years 1910-15, but in compensation we are given fifteen war-time letters between Valentini and Bethmann—of the highest interest. The diary itself is not included. The editor has evidently taken the footnotes of the

*Grosse Politik* as a model to avoid, and seems to have respected scrupulously the matter-of-fact candor and exactness of Valentini's own record. In this, Valentini reveals the finest qualities of the old-time Prussian *Beamte*, as well as certain characteristic limitations: so methodical and orderly a mind was ill-adapted to face the shifting and unknown quantities of war-time. Above all, his book stands out among contemporary German memoirs in preserving to the last certain reserves and loyalties—a loyalty to the historic fact among others. He makes no scapegoats; pays off no scores; offers no whining apologia, and neglects in his text even the most obvious opportunities to rectify his own rôle in the light of the final outcome:

Ist es nicht auch ein Zeichen unserer Auflösung und des Zusammenbruches der wilhelminischen Ara, dass die höchsten Würdeträger von früher—zur Selbstbeweihräucherung—sich gegenseitig anklagen und die Schuld vorwerfen? Tirpitz hält freilich auch hierin den Rekord. . . . Aber die jetzige Manie der Enthüllungen und des Flagellantums, von dem wir befallen sind, ist geradezu selbstvernichtend.

In addition to innumerable *précisions* on points of detail, the book brings out the degree to which Bethmann went in reaching over into the military conduct of the war. Valentini, representing also the civil power, went steadily beside him in this course. Together they sought to override Falkenhayn by urging an Eastern campaign for 1915; and although he proceeded along safer lines Valentini supported Bethmann's fatal impulse to escape responsibility by abdicating the political authority of the state into the hands of Hindenburg-Ludendorff. The Great Pair, when at last appointed, gave warm thanks for this assistance. "Wir hatten ja auch redlich für sie gearbeitet," so Valentini noted. Four months later Hindenburg summoned William II to dismiss Bethmann. Oddly enough, it was the military adviser, General von Lyncker, who held to a proper constitutional basis; while from first to last the emperor opposed this abdication of his own and the civil authority. Whether from intuition or fear or a shrewder judgment of the personal factors, William resisted more stoutly, and longer, than anyone else in Germany. With little pretense to sound judgment, in the end he held closer to sound policy and to constitutional procedure than did Valentini or Bethmann, his responsible civilian advisers.

Although neither author nor editor discusses the point, the facts revealed are more damaging to Hindenburg's reputation than anything heretofore in print. One has clung to an impression that he tempered Ludendorff's top-chargeant extravagances by a touch of political sanity and moderation; this hope seems shattered once for all. In every important issue he marches in lockstep behind his *alter ego*; and when his personality occasionally emerges it is to no better advantage. In August, 1915, Bethmann, in commenting on the campaign to discredit the supreme command, complains of the "falsehoods and extravagances" in the *communiqués* from Hindenburg's headquarters. In December, 1916, just after the German peace note, Bethmann wrote confidentially: "In addition to Courland and Lithuania Hindenburg insists

on having (*inter alia*) Brest-Litovsk and Byelowisch for *Prussia*." In the west an equally drastic line was decided on: the Kaiser informed Valentini (January, 1918): "We must retain Flanders; the Walloon country can remain by itself or go to France."

T. H. THOMAS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

---

*The neutrality of Norway in the World War.* By PAUL G. VIGNESS, PH.D. ("Stanford University publications, University series, history, economics, and political science," Vol. IV, No. 1.) Stanford University, California: Stanford University Press, 1932. Pp. 188. Paper, \$1.50; cloth, \$2.00.

On a desk at the head of the main stairway in the Norwegian parliament house lies a huge volume. Highly polished sheets of copper are bound together to form a book. On these permanent pages are engraved the names of the men and ships of Norway that perished during the Great War. This eloquent memorial tells the story of over twelve hundred sailors and a million and a quarter tons of vessels that never returned to the home ports because of mines and torpedoes. Just as the Eidsvoll Gallery gives a picture of the struggle for independence in 1814, so this monument depicts the hardships endured by Norway a century later to maintain her sovereignty through a dangerous neutrality. Through the co-operation of the Carnegie Foundation many of Norway's war-time difficulties have been brought to the attention of the English-speaking world by Professor Wilhelm Keilhau, of Oslo. The policy of neutrality, however, and the manifold negotiations undertaken in order to maintain it and at the same time keep a people from starvation by enforced isolation is now subjected to thorough scrutiny in the treatise of Dr. Vigness.

After describing Norway in 1914 and the manner in which the first shock of the war was weathered, Dr. Vigness discusses the early military measures affecting the country. The effect of the British blockade, the copper and fish agreements of 1916, Norwegian-German relations in 1916, and the unrestricted submarine warfare inaugurated during the following year are then outlined. Three chapters deal with the relations between Norway and the United States in 1917, the prolonged conversations leading to the trade agreement between the two countries, and the consummation of that agreement. A discussion of Norway at the Peace Conference and in the "world settlement" completes the book, save for a brief conclusion.

The account revolves around the difficulty of holding the neutral position in the face of constant German aggression and an increasingly rigorous inter-allied blockade. "No nation aside from those originally involved had greater provocation to enter the war than Norway." To keep the peace under such circumstances was a strenuous undertaking. Some doubt may be expressed as to Norway's ability to have done so alone. Certainly that country's posi-

tion would have been much more precarious without the firm support of the other Scandinavian powers.

In this connection it may be asked whether a chapter on inter-Scandinavian relations during the war should not have been included. Many of the Norwegian representations to the warring powers, from the declaration of neutrality of August 8, 1914, to the close of the war, were made in conjunction with similar action by the other two Scandinavian states, thereby giving them much more weight. The intensification of inter-Scandinavian trade in 1917 and 1918 was of no little importance in enabling Norway to pull through a period made more acute by the unrestricted submarine warfare. The various royal and ministerial conferences which were held were also of significance. Admiral Consett's reference to the first of these as being "instigated by Germany" (p. 169) cannot be given too much credence, nor can it be fairly stated in the light of available evidence that "German pressure was exerted through Swedish officials upon the representatives of Norway and Denmark" in these conferences. German activity in this respect was largely restricted to certain court functionaries whose real influence was negligible. Besides, the most important of these conferences were not always the spectacular ones attended by the rulers. It was the regular meetings, over thirty in all, held under the auspices of the different governmental departments together with much other co-operation, which enabled Scandinavia to stand as a bulwark of peace in the troubled seas around her shores.

A few minor reservations may also be made. Trondhjem (p. 15) became Nidaros in 1929 and was altered again in 1931 to Trondheim. Although the literal translation of *Venstre* (p. 17) is "Left," the Norwegian party of that name is more apt to gravitate toward the center. It is not wholly correct to compare Norway's governmental system to that of England. The Storting cannot be dissolved, it is absolutely all-powerful; and, as a result, ministries are almost inevitably weak. The creation of the Foreign Affairs Committee (pp. 138, 152) was not entirely due to the reason assigned. Earlier in the war the government had from time to time taken party leaders and Storting officials into its confidence as to foreign policy, and when the prime minister strongly urged a more permanent line of communication between ministers and parliament in the speech from the throne in 1917 his strongest Storting supporter, Mowinkel, brought in a bill for the Committee. Sweden had provided for some parliamentary advice and control of foreign policy in 1809; and throughout the period of the war, except in 1915, a committee existed in the Riksdag for that purpose. It is not unlikely that this influenced Norway. Although Norwegian sovereignty over Spitzbergen was recognized at Paris (p. 168), Norway did not proclaim it until August 14, 1925. By that time Russia had also recognized Norwegian suzerainty. Finally, it might be mentioned that Norway began replacing lost tonnage at an early period of the war by contracting for new ships, first and foremost in the United States, where contracts for about one million tons were placed 1917. Just how this

was affected, if at all, by our entry into the war, and whether or not it was of importance in the Norwegian-American negotiations which followed, is not stated. These are details of little importance to the main treatment of Dr. Vigness and must not be permitted to detract from his sound and informative discussion.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ERIC CYRIL BELLQUIST

---

*Československá Amerika v Odboji* [Czechoslovak America in revolt].

By VOJTA BENEŠ. Vol. I. Prague: Pokrok Publishing Co., 1932. Pp. ii+425. Kc. 61.

Owing to the fact that American Czechoslovaks financed the Czechoslovak revolutionary movement during the Great War, the history of this movement in the United States is of considerable importance. The author, a brother of Dr. Beneš, the present Czechoslovak foreign minister, was one of the leaders of the Czechoslovak organization in this country, and hence bases his treatment on his own personal experiences; but at the same time he does justice to historical scholarship by supporting his conclusions with carefully selected documentary evidence much of which is hardly accessible to students today. The first volume deals wholly with the background of the Czech and Slovak immigrants in the United States down to the year 1914, when the whole movement was divided and under the Slavonophile influence. The last pages of the volume show the gradual formation of the organization which eventually exerted a strong influence on the American attitude toward the Central Powers. This latter phase is to be treated in the forthcoming volumes which, if they are written in the same character as this volume, will be a real contribution to our understanding of the period just before America entered the war and even more of the methods which led to the formation of the Czechoslovak republic. The activities of many well-known figures appear throughout the volume (Newton D. Baker, Jane Addams, Robert J. Kerner, Karel Peřgler, Michel Pupin, Herbert A. Miller, Archibald Cary Coolidge, etc.).

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

CENTENARY JUNIOR COLLEGE  
HACKETTSTOWN, NEW JERSEY

---

*The revolt of the masses.* By JOSÉ ORTEGA Y GASSET. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1932. Pp. 204. \$2.75.

Beguiled by the brilliant cover and the no less lurid title, someone may be led incautiously to read this volume, hoping to find a thriller, a tale of murder and sudden death. If he be so beguiled, it is all to the good, for he will find the pages quite as stimulating if not so exciting as detective fiction. And yet in all fairness, he should be warned in advance that the author is a professor of

metaphysics and a philosopher who believes that what Europe needs is not turmoil, but a philosophy: "It is the one thing that can save her." If the reader seeks no more than a charming literary style, the glitter and sparkle of epigram, clever and audacious aphorism, he will not be disappointed but amply repaid for the reading; and if one is compelled to bow to the author's skill, he should be prepared also to make due obeisance to the translator.

Every page includes a statement which stimulates thought or awakens doubts if not opposition; and no brief review can properly portray the author's thesis. He believes Europe to be in a bad way, not because there is imminent danger of riot and tumult, but because of the incompetence of the common man and the incapacity of the masses, who by dint of sheer numbers hold sway. "The mass is all that which sets no value on itself—good or ill—based on specific grounds, but which feels itself 'just like everybody,' and nevertheless is not concerned about it." Everybody, it appears, is contented with his own stupidity because he has succeeded in becoming as completely stupid as his neighbor. The mass man, whose incapacities endanger European civilization, may be either a millionaire or a hodcarrier; but whoever he may be, he is far from any appreciation of the modern scientific world and its problems and he rides along in his automobile quite unaware of the thought, energy, and time put into the machine which carries him on his useless journey. And still, not everyone is content. To recognize one's own limitations and to struggle for improvement is the mark of intelligence; and there are some persons capable of real leadership. But without leaders the mass is worse than helpless. A man who fights his own destiny is doomed, and the destiny of the common run of mankind is to be ruled by their superiors. This, by the way, has a familiar sound, for it means what one of the Fathers of our own constitutional system meant when he said, "There are inequalities which God and nature have planted there, and which no human legislator can ever eradicate." Thus, instead of finding, as we might suppose, the danger of tumult as the fruit of discontent, the author finds peril lurking in placid incapacity. Sluggish contentment, on the supposition that by counting noses we can find our way to achievement and be lifted to a new heaven on flowery beds of ease, is the author's special abhorrence. A man or a nation floundering about without ideals and without a stimulating philosophy of life is sure to get permanently fastened in the mire. But he does believe there is such a thing as civilization—this is a comforting admission. There is consolation also in finding that there is a Europe, an entity, which flaming nationalism has for the moment obscured, and that the nations which have been flaunting their nationalism are "beginning to withdraw from their bellicose plurality."

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### GENERAL

*Abstracts in history: from dissertations for the degree of doctor of philosophy as accepted by the graduate college of the State University of Iowa, 1922-1930.* ("University of Iowa studies in the social sciences," Vol. X, No. 2.) Iowa City, Iowa: State University of Iowa, 1932. Pp. 170.

The subjects dealt with belong mainly to American history. In the modern European field may be noted: "Anglo-Spanish commercial relations, 1700-1750," by J. H. St. John; "The international status of Belgium, 1813-1839," by H. R. Anderson; and "Anglo-Russian rivalry in the Far East, 1895-1905," by W. G. Swartz.

*The Red flag: the story of the greatest revolutionary movements in the history of the world.* By F. BRITTEN AUSTIN. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1932. 8s. 6d.

A series of twelve historical novels, beginning with ancient Egypt and ending in the next century, somewhere in the middle of what is now the United States, when the world has been Red for fifty years.

*Modes and manners.* By MAX VON BOEHN. Translated from the German by JOAN JOSHUA. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1932.

*The balance of the continents.* By MARIANO H. CORNEJO. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. \$2.25.

A history of the idea of war, from its conception as an instrument of religion to a crime.

*Great travel stories of all nations.* Edited by ELIZABETH D'OYLEY. London: Harrap, 1932. 8s. 6d.

One hundred and fourteen stories from twenty-four nations, from the fourteenth century B.C. to the present.

*The history of piracy.* By PHILIP GOSSE. London: Longmans, 1932. 15s.

*Les grands combats sur mer de Salamine au Jutland.* By J. R. HALE. ("Collection historique.") Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 416. Fr. 25.

*Great moments in history.* By SAMUEL NISENSEN and ALFRED PARKER. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1932.

A survey, in drawings and text, of one hundred and fifty decisive events in history.

*A general history of nursing.* By LUCY RIDGELY SEYMER. London: Faber & Faber, 1932. 12s. 6d.

*Survivors' tales of famous shipwrecks.* By WALTER WOOD. London: Bles, 1932. Pp. 272. 8s. 6d.

### EARLY MODERN HISTORY

*Gutenberg and the Book of Books, with bibliographical notes, reproductions of specimen pages and a listing of known copies.* By HENRY LEWIS JOHNSON. New York: William Rudge, 1932.

*The life of the Emperor Charles of Austria.* By HERBERT VIVIAN. London: Grayson & Grayson, 1932. Pp. 310. 18s.

*Kaiser Karl V. und Papst Paul III. (1534-1549).* By WALTER FRIEDENSBURG. ("Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte," Jahrgang 50, Heft 1 [No. 153].) Leipzig: Heinsius, 1932. Pp. 99. Rm. 2.60.

*La cour du Pape Paul III.* By LÉON DOREZ. 2 vols. Paris: Leroux, 1932. Fr. 400.  
*The two treatises of Servetus on the Trinity. On the errors of the Trinity, seven books, A.D. MDXXXI. Dialogues on the Trinity, two books. On the righteousness of Christ's kingdom, four chapters, A.D. MDXXXII.* By MICHAEL SERVETO *alias* Reves, a Spaniard of Aragon. Now first translated into English by EARL MORSE WILBUR, D.D. ("Harvard Theological Studies," Vol. XVI.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. xxxviii+264. \$2.50.

*Faustus Socinus.* By DAVID MUNROE CORY. Boston: Beacon Press, 1932. \$2.00.  
*Calvinism and the religious wars.* By FRANKLIN CHARLES PALM. ("Berkshire studies in European History.") New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1932. Pp. 117. \$1.00.

The first third of this slender volume is devoted to Calvin's career in Geneva; the second third, to the wars of religion in France; the last, to a rapid survey of Calvinism in the rest of continental Europe, in Scotland, England, and the New World. The familiar thesis is maintained that Calvinism tended to encourage individualism and democracy, and by its emphasis on thrift and hard work was fitted to appeal especially to the rising middle class. The first third of the book is a valuable and coherent summary for the freshman survey course, though Calvin's views on the nature of obedience are perhaps unduly simplified and their relation to the theory of the papacy under Boniface VIII might be made clearer. Also in the eagerness to emphasize economic causation, the history of Geneva is somewhat distorted. The picture of the flourishing quarterly fairs belongs rather to the fifteenth century than to the sixteenth. But these are details. The remainder of the book suffers, necessarily, from compression. An account of the religious wars which omits all explanation of the work of the Council of Trent and of the forces of the counter-Reformation can hardly be satisfactory. And one is puzzled to guess what idea the average undergraduate would gather from a survey in thirty-odd small pages of the progress of Calvinism in a dozen countries throughout two centuries. Professor Palm's heroic attempt indicates the limitations of the plan of the "Berkshire studies." So protean and widely ramified a phenomenon as Calvinism can be more coherently presented in a work of broader scope in which its manifestations do not have to be isolated from the general movement of European history. The style is clear, simple, and colorless. The selected bibliography contains valuable suggestions. There is an index.

GARRETT MATTINGLY

*Calvin: a modern biography.* By JEAN MOURA and PAUL LOUVET. New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1932. \$2.50.

*Der eiserne Papst Sixtus V. und seine Zeit.* By ALEXANDER FREIHERR VON HÜBNER. Berlin: Aretz, 1932. Pp. 323. Rm. 3.80.

*La France et la Pologne à travers les siècles jusqu'à la grande révolution.* By STANISLAS LUKASIK. Paris: Gebethner & Wolff, 1932. Pp. 108. Fr. 15.

*The birth of the nations. From the unity of faith to the democracy of money.* By VALERIUS MARCU. Translated by EDEN and CEDAR PAUL. New York: Viking Press, 1932. Pp. 287.

A study of the great men of the Thirty Years' War, Wallenstein, Mazarin, Campanella, etc.

*Gustav Adolf und Deutschland.* By DIETRICH SCHÄFER, JOHANNES PAUL, BRUNO GEISLER. ("Schweden und Nordeuropa," No. 1.) Stettin: Ostsee-Druck und Verlag, 1932. Pp. 40. Rm. 1.

*Blessed Spinoza. A biography.* By LEWIS BROWNE. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 319. \$4.00.

*Spinoza: liberator of God and man.* By BENJAMIN DE CASSERES. New York: Sweetland, 1932. Pp. 145. \$2.00.

*Spinoza the biosopher.* By FREDERICK KETTNER. Introduction by NICHOLAS ROERICH. New York: Roerich Museum, 1932. Pp. 255. \$2.50.

*Spinoza; a life of reason.* By ABRAHAM WOLFSON. New York: Modern Classics, 1932. \$3.50.

*Die Entstehung und Entwicklung der ständigen diplomatischen Vertretung Brandenburg-Preussens am Zarenhofe bis zum Eintritt Russlands in die Reihe der europäischen Grossmächte.* By JOSEF KRUSCHE. ("Jahrbücher für Kultur und Geschichte der Slaven," N.S., Vol. VIII, No. 2.) Breslau: Priebatsch, 1932. Pp. 78. Rm. 3.

*Porcelain as an art and a mirror of fashion.* By ROBERT SCHMIDT. Translated by W. A. THORPE. London: Harrap, 1932. 25s.

The director of the Schlossmuseum in Berlin draws a fascinating picture of porcelain and its place in eighteenth-century social life.

*The elegant woman.* By GERTRUDE ARETZ. Translated from the German, with a preface, by JAMES LAVER. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1932. \$5.00.

A history of the fashionable woman from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present day.

*Casanova finanziere. Avventure di denaro e amore.* By C. MEUCCI. ("Le scie.") Milan: Mondadori, 1932. Pp. 318. L. 25.

## EUROPE SINCE 1789

*A cultural history of the modern age.* By EGON FRIEDEL. Translated by CHARLES R. ATKINSON. Vol. III. New York: Knopf, 1932. Pp. 538. \$5.00.  
From the French Revolution to the present.

*L'invasione francese degli Abruzzi (1794-1810).* By L. COPPA-ZUCCARI. 2 vols. Aquila: Vecchioni, 1932. Pp. lxxii+1203+1762. L. 150.

*Bonaparte en Égypte.* By J.-L. GASTON PASTRE. Paris: Éditions des Portiques, 1932. Fr. 12.

*Metternich and the British government.* By C. S. B. BUCKLAND. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. xxii+534. \$6.25.

*L'unione europea e Grande Alleanza del 1814-15.* By C. CAPASSO. Florence: "La Nuova Italia," 1932. Pp. 226. L. 15.

*List of the serial publications of foreign governments, 1815-1931.* Edited by WINFRED GREGORY for the American Council of Learned Societies, American Library Association, National Research Council. New York: Wilson, 1932. Pp. 720.

*War and western civilization, 1832-1932: a study of war as a political instrument and the expression of mass democracy.* By MAJOR-GENERAL J. F. C. FULLER, C.B. London: Duckworth, 1932. Pp. 287. 10s.

A strong criticism of the general-staff point of view by a distinguished soldier and military writer.

*P. Giovanni Roothaan XXI generale della Compagnia di Gesù (1785-1853).* By P. PIRRI. Island of Liri: Macioce & Pisani, 1932. Pp. 551. L. 17.

*Histoire contemporaine.* By RISSON and MOUSSET. Vol. II, *La France et le monde de 1848 à 1931.* Paris: Dunod, 1932. Pp. 320. Fr. 18.

*England und Preussen in der Schleswig-Holsteinischen Frage.* By DR. CHARLOTTE SEMPELL. ("Historische Studien," No. 219.) Berlin: Ebering, 1932. Pp. 98. Rm. 4.

*Railways and scenery.* By J. P. PEARSON. 4 vols. London: Cassell, 1932. £3 3s.  
A record of travels by railway and steamer between 1888 and 1914.

*Světová politika v letech 1871-1914.* By JOSEF SUSTA. Vol. VI. Prague: Vesmir, 1931. Pp. 444.

Covers the years 1909-14.

- Rafael, Cardinal Merry del Val: a character sketch.* By F. A. FORBES. London: Longmans, 1932. Pp. 179. 6s.  
Papal secretary of state under Pius X.
- Pius XI.* By DENIS GWYNN. ("Makers of the modern age.") New York: Studio Publications, 1932. \$1.50.
- Colonial policy.* By DR. A. D. A. DE KAT ANGELINO. Abridged translation from the Dutch by G. J. RENIER, in collaboration with the author. The Hague: Nijhoff; Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. 530+674. 42s.
- Albert Thomas (directeur du Bureau international du Travail), 1878-1932.* Annemasse, Haute-Savoie: Granchamp, 1932. Pp. 126.
- The conquest of the South Pole: Antarctic exploration, 1906-1931.* By J. GORDON-HAYES. London: Butterworth, 1932. Pp. 318. 18s.
- The flight of the swan.* By ANDRÉ OLIVEROFF and JOHN GILL. London: Dutton, 1932. \$4.00.  
A biography of Anna Pavlova.

## PRE-WAR DIPLOMACY

- France and Germany: the history of one thousand years.* By PROFESSOR JOHANNES HALLER. Translated by DORA VON BESELER. London: Constable, 1932. 7s. 6d.
- France and Germany.* By W. G. MOORE. London: Society for Christian Missions, 1932. Pp. 154. 2s. 6d.
- La France et l'Allemagne.* By GASTON ZELLER, maître de conférences in the Faculty of Letters of Clermont-Ferrand. ("Collection Armand Colin," Section d'histoire et sciences économiques.) Paris: Colin, 1932. Pp. 212. Fr. 10.50.  
In a rapid, well-packed survey, this little book reviews the most important aspects of both political and cultural relations between France and the Germanies from the Treaty of Verdun (843) to the Treaty of Locarno (1925). The tone is egregiously impartial. The author maintains that the doctrine of "natural boundaries" played no important part in the affairs of the two countries until the Revolution (p. 154) and that the two peoples have more often been friends and allies than enemies: "their antagonism has no profound causes, it has had an accidental character" (pp. 203-4).
- Wir und Frankreich.* By ERICH CZECH-JOCHBERG. Oldenburg: Stalling, 1932. Pp. 216. Rm. 3.50.  
A review of Franco-German relations since 1793.
- Documents diplomatiques français relatifs aux origines de la guerre de 1914.* Published by the MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES. Edited by the COMMISSION DE PUBLICATION DES DOCUMENTS RELATIFS AUX ORIGINES DE LA GUERRE DE 1914. 1st series (1871-1900). Vol. IV, 13 mai 1881-20 février 1882. Paris: Costes, 1932. Pp. xxxvii+614. Fr. 60.
- Deutschlands Schicksalsbund mit Österreich-Ungarn: von Conrad von Hötzendorf zu Kaiser Karl.* By A. VON CRAMON and PAUL FLECK. Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1932. Pp. 231.
- Erinnerungen und Gedanken des Botschafters Anton Graf Monts.* Edited by KARL FRIEDRICH NOWAK and FRIEDRICH THIMME. Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1932. Pp. 606. Rm. 14.50.
- Die unzureichende Kriegsrüstung der Mittelmächte als Hauptursache ihrer Niederlage.* By HUGO KERNACHE. Vienna: Verlag der militärwissenschaftlichen Mitteilungen, 1932. Pp. 64.
- Un prélude à l'invasion de la Belgique: le plan Schlieffen 1904.* By MAURICE PALÉOLOGUE. Paris: Plon, 1932. Pp. 170. Fr. 9.

- Souvenirs d'un attaché naval en Allemagne et en Autriche.* By AMIRAL DE FARAMOND. Paris: Plon, 1932. Pp. 232.
- Auf dem Wege zum Völkerbund. Zarte Geheimnisse der Entente-Mächte 1906 bis 1914.* By FERDINAND DREHER. 3d ed. Friedberg: Oberhess. Anzeiger, 1932. Pp. 40. Rm. 0.30.
- Deutschfeindliche Kräfte im Foreign Office der Vorkriegszeit. Materialien zu Band VII der "Britischen Dokumente."* By HERMANN LUTZ. Berlin: Quaderverlag, 1932. Pp. 43. Rm. 0.60.
- Part I offers an analysis of the Germanophobia of Sir Eyre Crowe, Sir William Tyrrell and other officials of the British foreign office; in Part II the Cartwright interview of 1911 is discussed at length.
- British documents on the origins of the war, 1898-1914.* Edited by G. P. GOOCH and HAROLD TEMPERLEY. Vol. VIII, *Arbitration, neutrality and security.* London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1932. Pp. lxiv+797. 17s. 6d.
- Der serbische Zugang zum Meer und die europäische Krise 1912.* By RICHARD GIESCHE. ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der nachbismarckischen Zeit und des Weltkriegs," No. 16.) Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Pp. 84. Rm. 3.60.
- Italy and the Great War: from neutrality to intervention.* By ANTONIO SALANDRA. Translated by Z. K. PYNE. New York: Longmans, 1932. \$6.00.
- "*L'abominable vénalité de la presse.*" *D'après les documents des archives russes (1897-1917).* Paris: Librairie du Travail, 1932. Pp. 450.
- Comment la Roumanie s'est détachée de la Triplice.* By N. JORGA. Paris: Gamber, 1932. Pp. 78. Fr. 10.
- Die Verantwortlichen im Weltkrieg.* By ERICH CZECH-JOCHBERG. Leipzig: Koehler, 1932. Pp. 235. Rm. 2.85.
- La grande vérité sur les responsabilités de la guerre.* By LEON SAVADJIAN. Paris: Revue des Balkans, 1932. Fr. 12.
- Kriegsschuldfrage und Kriegsverhütungsrecht.* By DR. PAUL SERWISCHER. ("Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien," No. 49.) Berlin: Ebering, 1932.
- Le procès de la Hongrie.* By BARON J. DE SZILÁSSY. Paris: Alcan, 1932. Pp. 261. Fr. 15.
- A former Austro-Hungarian diplomatist discusses the question of Hungary's responsibility for the war, and the Treaty of Trianon.
- Vorgeschichte und Geschichte des Weltkriegs im Geschichtsunterricht.* By DR. HEINRICH WALTHER. ("Der neue Geschichtsunterricht," Vol. VII.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Pp. 205.

## THE GREAT WAR

- Histoire de la guerre.* By JEAN GALTIER-BOISSIÈRE. Vol. II. Paris: Le Crapouillot, 1932. Fr. 12.
- La bataille des frontières.* By COLONEL E. VALARCHÉ. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 211.
- Les armées françaises dans la grande guerre.* Tome VI, Vol. I, *La préparation de la campagne 1918. L'offensive allemande de l'Oise à la Mer du Nord.* Tome IX, Vol. II, *Les campagnes coloniales, Togo, Cameroun, A. O. F., A. E. F.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1932. Fr. 500, 790.
- Mémoires.* By MARÉCHAL JOFFRE. Vol. I, *L'avant guerre. La guerre de mouvement.* Vol. II, *La guerre de stabilisation. L'offensive d'ensemble de l'Entente. La mission en Amérique.* Paris: Plon, 1932. Fr. 72.
- The personal memoirs of Joffre, field marshal of the French army.* Translated by COLONEL T. BENTLEY MOTT, D. S. M. 2 vols. New York: Harper, 1932. Pp. 657. \$6.00.

- Avec Joffre d'Agadir à Verdun.* By GÉNÉRAL ALEXANDRE. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 256. Fr. 20.
- Verdun.* By GÉNÉRAL BECKER. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 116. Fr. 12.
- Journal du commandant du 26<sup>e</sup> régiment d'infanterie de la division de fer, 1914-1915.* By GÉNÉRAL H. COLIN. ("Mémoires, études et documents pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre mondiale.") Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 388. Fr. 24.
- Des champs de bataille au désarmement.* By GÉNÉRAL FERRY. Paris: Querelle, 1932. Pp. 335.
- Feuilles françaises dans la tourmente: les héros de la presse clandestine dans le Nord envahi (1914-1918).* By HENRY DE FORGE and JEAN MAUCLÈRE. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 244.
- Philibert, engagé volontaire (1914-1918).* By PH.-JEAN GRANGE. Paris: Michel, 1932. Pp. 256. Fr. 15.
- La guerre en action. Surprise d'une division: Rossignol—Saint-Vincent.* By COLONEL A. GRASSET. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 299.
- Le vrai visage du combattant 1914-1918.* By RAOUL MERCIER. Preface by GÉNÉRAL SERRIGNY. Paris: Charles-Lavauzelle, 1932. Pp. 218.  
The observations of a doctor.
- Das war das Ende (von Brest-Litowsk bis Versailles).* By BRUNO BREHM. Munich: Piper, 1932. Pp. 500. Rm. 4.40.
- Der Tag X. Die grosse Schlacht in Frankreich (21. März—5. April 1918).* By GUSTAV GOES. ("Unter dem Stahlhelm," Vol. VII.) Berlin: Tradition, 1933. Pp. 188. Rm. 3.50.
- Aller Seelen 1914. Kriegsfreiwillige vor Ypern.* By LUDWIG RITTER VON RUDOLPH. 2d ed. Nuremberg: Willmy, 1932. Pp. 94. Rm. 1.80.
- Die sächsische Armee in Krieg und Frieden: ihre Führer und Kriegsminister. Ein zusammenfassender Überblick.* By ARNOLD SCHULTZ-TRINIUS. Zeulenfoda in Thür.: B. Sporn, 1932. Pp. 285.
- Der Glaube an Deutschland: ein Kriegserleben von Verdun bis zum Umsturz.* By HANS ZÖBERLEIN. 3d ed. Munich: Eher, 1932. Pp. 890. Rm. 7.20.
- Das Gesicht der Westfront: ein Kriegsdokument und Erinnerungsbuch.* By ERNST VOLLBEHR. Under the patronage of KRONPRINZ WILHELM and various generals. Edited by DR. OTTO KORFES, archivist in the Reichsarchiv. Berlin: Artibus et Literis, 1932. Rm. 32.  
Colored reproduction of paintings of the western front made by an official artist.
- Young woman of 1914.* By ARNOLD ZWEIG. Translated by ERIC SUTTON. London: Secker, 1932. 7s. 6d.  
The prelude to *The case of Sergeant Grischa.*
- The annals of the King's Royal Rifle Corps. Vol. V, The Great War.* By MAJOR-GENERAL SIR STEUART HARE. London: Murray, 1932. 25s.
- "Langemarck" and "Cambrai": a war narrative, 1914-1918.* By CAPTAIN GEOFFREY DUGDALE, M.C. Shrewsbury: Wilding & Son, 1932. Pp. 132. 6s. 6d.
- The land-locked lake.* By LT.-COL. A. A. HANBURY-SPARROW. London: Barker, 1932. 7s. 6d.  
Severe criticisms of British methods by a Regular officer.
- Unwilling passenger.* By ARTHUR OSBURN. London: Faber & Faber, 1932. 10s. 6d.  
The title suggests the pacifist views of the author, who was a Regular medical officer and acquired them in the Boer War.

*Eyewitness.* By MAJOR-GENERAL SIR ERNEST D. SWINTON. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932. Pp. 321. 5s.

The author of *Eyewitness*, a well-known war-time book, now describes the invention and development of the tank, of which he was the originator.

*The nation at war.* By GENERAL PEYTON CONWAY MARCH. New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1932. \$5.00.

*Shoot and be damned!* By SERGEANT ED HALYBURTON and RALPH GOLL. New York: Covici-Friede, 1932. Pp. 452. \$2.50.

Experiences in German prison camps.

*A New York actor on the western front.* By HARRY KENDALL. Boston: Christopher, 1932. \$1.75.

*Lettere dal campo, 1917-1919, con note esplicative.* By E. OVAZZA. Preface by D. M. TUNINETTI. Turin: Casanova, 1931. Pp. xv+225. L. 10.

*The unknown war: the eastern front.* By the Rt. Hon. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931. Pp. xv+396. \$5.00.

*The unknown war* is the final canvas in the series of "last judgments" Mr. Churchill has delivered to an admiring world. It has much of the picturesque quality of the rest and the same great gift of never being dull; but it is a much more fragmentary and haphazard design. "I have attempted to give a general account of the whole war upon the Eastern front," the author explains, but there is no justification for any such claim. For so convinced an Easterner, the actual record of this front is curiously unable to hold Mr. Churchill's attention; and the rapid dwindling of his interest is the most striking feature of the book.

Out of 381 pages of text, the armies are not actually under way until page 144, and the 1914 campaigns are not ended before page 272. The whole field of the next two years is packed hastily into the remainder of the book; and the narrative ends abruptly with a conventional deathbed scene in farewell to Francis Joseph. A postscript of 7 pages notes the fact of the revolution in Russia; for the rest, the events of 1917 and 1918 are cut dead. Even in the period covered, the general field is touched on or ignored according to whim: the term "Eastern front" is made to include the evacuation of Antwerp; but the Rumanian campaign, the Salonica front, and the large-scale operations in the Caucasus are excluded *en bloc*. We are given more than a page of Frau Schrott, but the name of the Austrian commander-in-chief during half the war is not once mentioned.

T. H. THOMAS

*Le premier généralissime des armées russes: le grand-duc Nicolas. Son rôle dans la guerre mondiale (1914-1915).* By GÉNÉRAL Y. DANILOV. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 180.

*Bitwa pod Kamorowem.* By EDWARD IZDEBSKI. Warsaw: Wojskowe Biura Historyczne, 1931. Pp. 436.

A study of the great Austro-Russian battle of 1914, based on the Vienna war archives.

*Na voine Vostochnaia Prussia-Litva.* By A. A. USPENSKY. Kaunas: Author, 1932. Pp. 228.

East Prussia and Lithuania in 1914-15.

*Ot Urala do Kharbina.* By G. V. ENBORISSOV. Shanghai, 1932. Pp. 168.

Recollections of the war in Siberia.

*Zážitky a dojmy ruského čecha za carství.* By FEDOR KOVÁŘEK. ("Prameny k dejinám vzájemných styků slovanských," Vol. II.) Prague: "Orbis," 1932. Pp. 346. Kč. 50.

*Die Wahrheit über die tschechische Legion im weissen Sibirien.* By DR. MARTIN SPAHN and KONSTANTIN W. SACHAROV. Berlin: Hendriock, 1932. Pp. 68. Rm. 1.60.

*Constantinople et les Détroits. Traduction intégrale des documents secrets de l'ancien minis-*

- Ètre des affaires étrangères de Russie.* Edited by A. DE LAPRADELLE, L. EISENMANN, P. RENOUVIN, B. MIRKINE-GUETZÉVITCH. 2 vols. Paris: Éditions internationales, 1932.
- Die grosse Politik der Mächte im Weltkrieg.* Vol. V, Part 2, *Die europäischen Mächte und Griechenland während des Weltkrieges.* Vol. VI, Part 3, *Die europäischen Mächte und die Türkei während des Weltkrieges. Die Aufteilung der asiatischen Türkei. Nach den Geheimdokumenten des ehemaligen russischen Ministeriums für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten.* Dresden: Reissner, 1932. Pp. 339-315. Rm. 30.
- Le drame balkanique de 1915: l'automne serbe.* By MARCEL DUNAN. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 271.
- Greek memories.* By COMPTON MACKENZIE. London: Cassell, 1932. 8s. 6d.  
A continuation of *Gallipoli memories* and *First Athenian memories*; suppressed by the British government for its revelations of war-time secrets.
- Tigris gunboats. A narrative of the Royal Navy's co-operation with the military forces in Mesopotamia from the beginning of the war to the capture of Bagdad (1914-17).* By VICE-ADMIRAL WILFRID NUNN, C.B. London: Melrose, 1932. Pp. 288. 18s.
- Was mir die Engländer über Ostafrika erzählten. Zwanglose Unterhaltungen mit ehemaligen Gegnern.* By GENERAL PAUL VON LETTOW-VORBECK. Leipzig: Koehler, 1932. Pp. 64. Rm. 1.50.
- La doctrine de l'aviation française de combat au cours de la guerre.* By GÉNÉRAL VOISIN. Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1932. Pp. 172. Fr. 25.
- Los titanes de la mar. Acciones navales de la gran guerra (1914-1918).* By MATEO MILLE. Barcelona: Iberia, 1932. Pp. 115 and 50 photographs. Pes. 4.50.
- The concise history of the Dover patrol.* By ADMIRAL SIR R. H. BACON. London: Hutchinson, 1932. Pp. 320. 12s. 6d.  
A revised and condensed edition of *The Dover patrol, 1915-1917* (1919).
- Number Thirteen.* Being the autobiography of REAR-ADMIRAL GORDON CAMPBELL, V.C., D.S.O., M.P. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932. Pp. 352. 20s.  
More reminiscences of the famous commander of the "Q" ships, who has already published *My mystery ships*.
- Hell's angels of the deep.* By WILLIAM GUY CARR. London: Hutchinson, 1932. 10s. 6d.  
An introduction and supplement to the author's *By guess and by God*, which dealt with submarine warfare. Based on diaries, it throws side lights on the British navy in the Great War.
- The big blockade.* By E. KEBLE CHATTERTON. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1932. Pp. 287. 18s.  
Concerned primarily with the work of the Tenth Cruiser Squadron which patrolled between the north of Scotland and the Arctic Circle.
- 40 O.B., or how the war was won.* By HUGH CLELAND HOY. Foreword by SIR BASIL THOMSON, K.C.B. London: Hutchinson, 1932. Pp. 287. 15s.  
"40 O.B." was room 40 in the old buildings of the British admiralty, where German wireless messages were decoded, but little new is published.
- Death of a fleet, 1917-1919.* By PAUL ACHUBERT and LANGHORNE GIBSON. New York: Coward-McCann, 1932. \$3.00.  
The end of the German navy.
- Les dessous de la guerre révélés par les comités secrets.* By PAUL ALLARD. Paris: Éditions de France, 1932. Fr. 15.



- Von Pater Philippart, von Cardinal Mercier und von anderen unbekanntem Soldaten.* By CARL HERMANN. Tübingen: Verein für Kriegsschuldforschung, 1932. Pp. 120.  
A discussion of the use of the Jesuit Order in the French secret service.
- Go spy the land: being the adventures of I.K.8 of the British secret service.* By CAPTAIN GEORGE A. HILL, D.S.O. London: Cassell, 1932. 8s. 6d.  
Salonika and Russia.
- Marthe Richard: the skylark.* By MAJOR GEORGES LEDOUX. Edited by WARRINGTON DAWSON. London: Cassell, 1932. 6s.  
The foremost woman spy of France.
- I was a spy!* By MARTHE MCKENNA. With foreword by the RT. HON. WINSTON CHURCHILL. London: Jarrolds, 1932. 12s. 6d.  
Mlle Marthe Crockaert, of Roulers, Belgium, now the wife of a British officer, who performed prodigies for the Allied secret service, was decorated by the British, French, and Belgian governments—and received the Iron Cross from the Germans for her gallant nursing.
- Die anderen Waffen.* By J. C. SILBER. Breslau: Korn, 1932. Pp. 303. Rm. 4.80. English translation: *The invisible weapons.* London: Hutchinson, 1932. 10s. 6d.  
The almost incredible story of a German who served in the British censorship throughout the war.
- Kriegsschuld und Reparationen auf der Pariser Friedenskonferenz.* By HAJO HOLBORN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Pp. 38.  
A German reply to the article on this subject by Camille Bloch and Pierre Renouvin in the *Revue d'histoire de la guerre mondiale*, January, 1932.

## AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

- Geschichte und Kulturleben Deutsch-Österreichs von 1526 bis 1792.* By HANS PIRCHEGGER. Vienna: Braumüller, 1932. Pp. 360. Sch. 21.  
A revision of Franz Martin Mayer's *Geschichte Österreichs*.
- Das Reich der Träumer. Eine Kulturgeschichte Österreichs vom Urzustand bis zur Republik.* By HANNS SASSMANN. Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1932. Pp. 432. Rm. 7.
- Die erzgebirgische Prägemedaille des 16. Jahrhunderts.* By VIKTOR KATZ. Prague: Schulz, 1932. Pp. 292.
- Die Juden und die Judengemeinde Bratislava in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Ein Sammelwerk.* Edited by HUGO GOLD. Brünn: Jüdischer Buch- und Kunstverlag, 1932. Pp. 192.
- The King of Rome.* By R. McNAIR WILSON. London: Davies, 1932. Pp. 159. 5s.  
This naïve book is largely pure fiction; the rest is piously derived from questionable sources for the purpose of proving that Napoleon II "would have reigned, as Napoleon had reigned, with the sole object of doing them [the country folk of France] good" (p. 149).
- The glory of the Hapsburgs. Memoirs of PRINCESS FUGGER.* Translated by J. A. GALSTON. New York: Dial Press, 1932. Pp. 321. \$5.00.
- Dr. Ignaz Seipel. Ein österreichisches und europäisches Schicksal.* By DR. BERNHARD BIRK. Regensburg: Manz, 1932. Pp. 280. Rm. 3.50.

## FRANCE

- The French race: theories of its origins and their social and political implications prior to the Revolution.* By JACQUES BARZUN. ("Studies in history, economics and public

- law," edited by the faculty of political science of Columbia University, No. 375.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 275. \$4.25.
- Huit cents ans de révolution française (983-1789)*. By HENRI DE JOUVENEL. Paris: Hachette, 1932. Fr. 12.
- The evolution of the French people*. By CHARLES SEIGNOBOS. Translated from the French by CATHERINE ALISON PHILLIPS. New York: Knopf, 1932. Pp. 382. \$4.25.
- Paris, ses origines, sa croissance, son histoire*. By BLANCHE MAUREL. Paris: Michel, 1932. Pp. 384. Fr. 25.
- Histoire de la campagne française*. By G. ROUPNEL. Paris: Grasset, 1932. Pp. 360. Fr. 18.
- Les chroniques du château de Compiègne*. By QUENTIN-BAUCHART. ("Chroniques des châteaux de France.") Paris: Roger, 1932. Pp. 268. Fr. 36.
- Manuel d'histoire de la franc-maçonnerie française*. By GASTON-MARTIN. 2d ed. Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1932. Pp. 284. Fr. 15.
- À propos de l'Édit de Nantes et de sa révocation. Un exemple d'historiographie catholique*. By DAVID LASSERRE. ("Éditions des cahiers protestants.") Lausanne: La Concorde, 1932. Pp. 62. Fr. 1.
- Les sources de l'histoire de France, XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1610-1715)*. By LÉON ANDRÉ. Vol. VI, *Histoire maritime et coloniale. Histoire religieuse*. Paris: Picard, 1932. Pp. 572. Fr. 35.
- Antoine Brun (1599-1654)*. By TRUCHIS DE VARENNES. Paris: Marion, 1932. Pp. 632. Fr. 100.
- Mémoires*. By CARDINAL DE RICHELIEU. Vol. X, 1629. Paris: Champion, 1932. Pp. 457. Fr. 40.
- La vie de Paris sous Louis XIII. L'existence pittoresque des parisiens au 17<sup>e</sup> siècle*. By LOUIS BATIFFOL. ("Notre vieux Paris.") Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1932. Pp. 264. Fr. 15.
- Louis XIV intime*. By LOUIS BERTRAND. ("Hier et aujourd'hui.") Paris: Flammarion, 1932. Pp. 128. Fr. 3.75.
- Fonctionnaires maritimes et coloniaux sous Louis XIV. Les Bégon*. By YVONNE BÉZARD. Paris: Michel, 1932. Pp. 340. Fr. 20.
- Madame de Pompadour*. By MARCELLE TINAYRE. ("Hier et aujourd'hui.") Paris: Flammarion, 1932. Pp. 128. Fr. 3.75.
- Denis Diderot: correspondance inédite*. Edited by ANDRÉ BABELON. 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1932.
- Denis Diderot: lettres à Sophie Volland*. Edited by ANDRÉ BABELON. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1932.
- Diderot*. By ANDRÉ BILLY. Paris: Éditions de France, 1932. Pp. 616. Fr. 30.
- A thorough study, based chiefly on the printed sources, though with some use of manuscript materials; without notes, but with an extensive bibliography. The generally scholarly tone is often spoiled by imaginative passages and ruminative digressions. While not a masterpiece of either biography or criticism, the book fills a great need fairly well.
- Memoirs of the Comte Alexandre de Tilly*. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1932. \$4.00.  
An eighteenth-century philanderer.
- Les papiers de Calonne*. Edited by CHRISTIAN DE PARREL. Cavaillon: Mistral, 1932. Fr. 15.
- Histoire constitutionnelle de la France de 1789 à 1870*. By MAURICE DESLANDRES. 2 vols. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1932. Pp. 1570. Fr. 190.

- Die französische Revolution 1789-1799.* By OTTO FLAKE. 2d ed. Leipzig: Hesse & Becker, 1932. Pp. 352. Rm. 5.
- The French revolution.* By CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN. 2 vols. New York: Holt, 1932. \$3.75.
- Grégoire and the French Revolution: a study.* By LORD ASHBOURNE. London: Sands, 1932. Pp. 236. 6s.
- Talleyrand.* By FRANZ BLEI. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1932. Rm. 9.50.
- Talleyrand.* By DUFF COOPER. London: Cape, 1932. Pp. 399. 12s. 6d.
- Simon de Sacy (1764-1799).* By JACQUES DE COURSAC. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1932. Pp. 234. Fr. 12.
- Les origines de referendum dans la constitution de 1793.* By MICHEL FRIDIEFF. Paris: Presses Universitaires, 1932. Pp. 322. Fr. 55.
- Les secrets de la Bastille.* By FRANTZ FUNCK-BRENTANO. ("Hier et aujourd'hui.") Paris: Flammarion, 1932. Pp. 128. Fr. 3.75.
- Le Chouan: Carlos Sourdat et son père, l'agent royal.* By LEMENUET DE LA JUGANNIÈRE. Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1932. Fr. 15.
- De la prison à l'échafaud.* By G. LENOTRE. ("Hier et aujourd'hui.") Paris: Flammarion, 1932. Pp. 128. Fr. 3.75.
- Sieyès: his life and his nationalism.* By GLYNDON G. VAN DEUSEN. ("Studies in history, economics and public law," edited by the faculty of political science of Columbia University, No. 362.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 170. \$3.00.
- Napoleon.* By JACQUES BAINVILLE. Translated by HAMISH MILES. Boston: Little, Brown, 1932. Pp. 405. \$3.75.
- Napoleon.* By HILAIRE BELLOC. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1932. Pp. 382. \$4.00.
- Le Consulat et l'Empire (1799-1809).* By LOUIS MADELIN. ("L'histoire de France racontée à tous.") Paris: Hachette, 1932. Fr. 25.
- Die Frauen um Napoleon.* By GERTRUDE ARETZ. ("Das Bergland-Buch.") Graz: Deutsche Vereins-Druckerei, 1932. Pp. 568.
- Napoleone che piange.* By G. GUATTERI. Florence: "La fiamma fedele," 1932. Pp. 104. L. 5.
- Napoléon, croquis de l'épopée.* By G. LENOTRE. ("La petite histoire.") Paris: Grasset, 1932. Fr. 15.
- The Bonapartes in the New World.* By E. M. ODDIE. London: Elkin Mathews, 1932. Pp. 302. 15s.
- Le retour de l'Île d'Elbe par étapes jusqu'à Grenoble. La route Napoléon.* By PASCAL ANATOMARCHI. Paris: Ficker, 1932. Pp. 100. Fr. 10.
- Retours de Sainte-Hélène.* By ALBÉRIC CAHUET. Paris: Fasquelle, 1932. Fr. 12.
- La grande peur de 1832.* By J. LUCAS-DUBRETON. Paris: Nouvelle Revue française, 1932. Fr. 15.
- Sous Louis-Philippe. Les Dandys.* By JACQUES BOULANGER. ("Nouvelle collection historique.") Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1932. Pp. 224. Fr. 15.
- Le vrai prince Napoléon.* By FRANÇOIS BERTHET-LELEUX. Paris: Grasset, 1932. Pp. 330. Fr. 20.
- Un ministre trop oublié. Chasseloup-Laubat.* By ALBERT DUCHÈNE. Paris: Société d'éditions géographiques, maritimes et coloniales, 1932. Pp. 298. Fr. 24.
- Minister of marine under Napoleon III.
- Napoleon III. und der polnische Aufstand von 1863. Beiträge zur Geschichte der öffentli-*

- chen Meinung in Frankreich.* By DR. KARL KAISER. Berlin-Charlottenburg: Hoffmann, 1932. Pp. 164. Rm. 2.80.
- Du vieux Paris au Paris moderne: Hausmann et ses prédécesseurs.* By ANDRÉ MORIZET. Paris: Hachette, 1932. Fr. 70.
- Eugenia de Guzmán, emperatriz de los franceses.* By MARQUÉS DE VILLA-URRUTIA. 2d edition. ("Vidas españolas e hispano-americanas del siglo XIX," Vol. X.) Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. Pp. 272. Pes. 5.
- Das war die Diktatur des Proletariats: die Pariser Kommune.* By SERGEJ ACHREM. Moscow: Verlagsgenossenschaft ausländischer Arbeiter, 1932. Pp. 61. Rm. 0.50.
- Georges Sorel: der revolutionäre Konservatismus.* By MICHAEL FREUND. Frankfurt-on-the-Main: Klostermann, 1932. Pp. 366. Rm. 12.50.
- L'abbé Frémont (1852-1912). Pour servir à l'histoire religieuse.* By AGNÈS SIEGFRIED. 2 vols. Paris: Alcan, 1932. Pp. 1503. Fr. 75.
- Au service de la France: neuf années de souvenirs.* By RAYMOND POINCARÉ. Vol. IX, *L'année trouble (1917).* Paris: Plon, 1932. Pp. 448. Fr. 36.
- La contribution du Maroc au ravitaillement de la France pendant la guerre (1914-1918). Conférence faite à l'exposition coloniale internationale, le 25 septembre 1931.* By INTENDANT GÉNÉRAL GRANDCLÉMENT. Paris: Fournier, n.d. Pp. 80.
- Histoire de France depuis la guerre.* By JEAN PRÉVOST. ("La collection Europe.") Paris: Éditions Rieder, 1932. Pp. 370. Fr. 15.

This somewhat discursive interpretation of contemporary French history, containing neither footnotes nor bibliography, is the framework of a more ambitious undertaking, "plutôt à consulter qu'à lire," to be entitled, *Histoire de France depuis la guerre: chronologie, documents officiels, statistiques, bibliographie critique*. The first third of the book concerns the period before 1920, while the remainder is devoted to a discussion of reconstruction in France and the repercussion of the international problems arising out of the Versailles Treaty upon internal politics. The author has adopted a broad definition of history, paying attention to social and economic tendencies, finding space for literary and artistic movements and even devoting a word to relativity, music, and Freud (pp. 119-34). Although confessedly the author was ten years ago a *jeune partisan révolutionnaire* who, tiring of so much doctrine, took up the study of present-day economic life at first hand, it is evident from the space and sympathetic treatment he gives labor, socialism, and radical politics that his interests are still inclined to the left. The preface throws down the gauntlet to the professional historian. History should be written, the author states, by men who have participated in the life of the period in which the events chronicled occur (objectively, of course), rather than by scholars of a later date who rely for their material upon lifeless documents—relics of a palpitating but forgotten past. M. Prévost fails to state whether he has discovered a magnifying glass which will unfold to the eye the most elusive of facts concerning this complicated era and array them in their proper perspective.

RAYMOND O. ROCKWOOD

#### GERMANY

- Germany: a companion to German studies.* Edited by JETHRO BITHELL. London: Methuen, 1932. 15s.
- Contains much historical information.
- Das Schicksalsbuch des deutschen Volkes. Von Hermann dem Cherusker bis Adolf Hitler.* By FREIHERR HANS HENNING GROTE. With 160 illustrations and explanatory text. Düsseldorf: Est-Est-Verlag, 1932. Pp. 327. Rm. 24.50.
- Deutsche Kultur in ihrer Entwicklung.* By DR. HEINRICH GÜNTER. Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer, 1932. Pp. 354. Rm. 8.60.
- Württembergische Vergangenheit. Festschrift des Württembergischen Geschichts- und Altertumsvereins zur Stuttgarter Tagung des Gesamtvereins der deutschen Geschichts- und*

- Allertumsvereine im September 1932.* Preface by DR. KARL WELLER. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932. Pp. 397. Rm. 12.
- Geschichte der Freimaurerei in Deutschland.* By DR. FERDINAND RUNKEL. 3 vols. Vols. I and II. Berlin: Hobbing, 1932. Pp. 415+360. Rm. 25 per vol.
- Bibliographie zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Glaubensspaltung 1517-1585.* Edited by KARL SCHOTTENLOHER for the Kommission zur Erforschung der Reformation und Gegenreformation. Leipzig: Hiersemann, 1932.
- Die Juden in der Mark Brandenburg bis zum Jahre 1571.* By DR. WERNER HEISE. ("Historische Studien," No. 220.) Berlin: Ebering, 1932. Pp. 367. Rm. 14.80.
- Die Entwicklung der Kulturlandschaft im Elsass bis zur Einflussnahme Frankreichs. Beiträge zu den kulturgeographischen Problemen der Oberrheinlande.* By DR. WERNER GLEY. ("Schriften des wissenschaftlichen Instituts der Elsass-Lothringer im Reich an der Universität Frankfurt," N.S., No. 5.) Frankfurt-on-the-Main: Elsass-Lothringen-Institut, 1932. Pp. 180. Rm. 6.75.
- Die Schweden. Erlebnisse einer kursächsischen Stadt im 30jährigen Kriege.* By DR. ERNST BORKOWSKY. Querfurt: Heimatverlag, 1932. Pp. 111. Rm. 2.50.
- Leipzig um 1632. Aus Zeit und Umwelt des Gustav Adolf-Vereins in seinen Anfängen.* Edited by OTTO LERCHE. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932. Pp. 95. Rm. 4.
- Die Stadt Weimar seit Ausgang des 30jährigen Krieges bis zum Beginn der klassischen Zeit (1648-1775).* By FRITZ FINK. ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stadt Weimar," No. 15.) Weimar: Fink, 1932. Pp. 15. Rm. 0.50.
- Die wirtschaftlichen Wirkungen und Folgen des Dreissigjährigen Krieges für die Mark Duderstadt.* By DR. ERICH WASMANN. Duderstadt: Mecke, 1932. Pp. 86. Rm. 2.80.
- Entwicklungsgeschichte Bayerns.* By DR. M. DOEBERL. Vol. II, *Vom Westfälischen Frieden bis zum Tode König Maximilians I.* Third enlarged edition. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1932. Pp. 636. Rm. 22.
- The memoirs of Glückel of Hameln.* Translated, with an introduction, by MARVIN LOWENTHAL. London: Harper, 1932. 12s. 6d.
- Deals largely with the inner life of the smaller Jewish communities in the seventeenth century.
- Friedrich der Grosse und die geistige Welt Frankreichs.* By WERNER LANGER. ("Hamburger Studien zu Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen," Vol. XI.) Hamburg: Seminar für romanische Sprachen und Kultur, 1932. Pp. xxii+195. Rm. 6.
- Die Behördenorganisation und die allgemeine Staatsverwaltung Preussens im 18. Jahrhundert.* Vol. XIII, *Akten vom Februar 1763 bis zum April 1766.* Edited by ERNST POSNER. ("Acta Borussia. Denkmäler der preussischen Staatsverwaltung im 18. Jahrhundert.") Berlin: Parey, 1932. Pp. 864. Rm. 68.
- Die schlesische Gutsherrschaft des ausgehenden 18. Jahrhunderts. Auf Grund der friderizianischen Urbare und mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der alten Kreise Breslau und Bolkenhain-Landeshut.* By ERNST EMIL KLOTZ. ("Darstellungen und Quellen zur schlesischen Geschichte," Vol. XXXIII.) Breslau: Trewendt & Granier, 1932. Pp. 120. Rm. 5.
- Three days of Geller's life.* By PHILIP F. W. OERTEL. Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1932. \$1.25.
- The story of an eighteenth-century German professor.
- German romanticism.* By OSKAR WALZEL. Authorized translation from the German by ALMA ELISE LUSSKY. London: Putnam, 1932. 17s. 6d.
- Memoiren um die Titanen. Erlebtes mit Goethe und den Bonapartes, im Kreise der Hohen-*

- zollern*. By DIANA VON PAPPENHEIM and JENNY VON GUSTEDT. Edited by RICHARD KÜHN. 2 vols. Dresden: Reissner, 1932. Pp. xxxi+343; 423. Rm. 14.
- Das Militärkabinett der preussischen Könige und deutschen Kaiser. Seine geschichtliche Entwicklung und staatsrechtliche Stellung 1787-1918*. By RUDOLF SCHMIDT-BÜCKEBURG. Berlin: Mittler, 1933. Pp. 304. Rm. 8.50.
- Von Scharnhorst zu Schlieffen, 1806-1906. 100 Jahre preussisch-deutschen Generalstabes*. Prepared by GEN. LT. A. D. FRIEDRICH VON COCHENHAUSEN, et al. Berlin: Mittler, 1932. Pp. 332. Rm. 15.
- Der württembergische Landsturm der Freiheitskriege 1813-1815*. By FRITZ SCHIELE. Würzburg: Amend, 1932. Pp. 91. Rm. 3.80.
- Soldaten. Preussisches Führertum von Waterloo bis Ypern. Idee, Geschichte und Gestalt des Offiziers*. By HERBERT BLANK. Oldenburg: Stalling, 1932. Pp. 471. Rm. 4.80.
- Der deutsche Kaisergedanke vor und nach dem Wiener Kongress*. By HELMUT TIEDEMANN. ("Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte," No. 143.) Breslau: Marcus, 1932. Pp. 175. Rm. 10.
- Carl August von Weimar als Soldat*. By DR. GEORG BAHLS. Berlin-Charlottenburg: Bernard & Graefe, 1932. Pp. 174. Rm. 3.75.
- Auswanderungsakten des Deutschen Bundestags (1817-1866) und der Frankfurter Reichsministerien (1848/49)*. Edited by GEORG LEIBBRANDT and FRITZ DICKMANN. ("Schriften des Deutschen Ausland-Instituts Stuttgart." Series C, "Dokumente des Auslandsdeutschums," Vol. III.) Stuttgart: Ausland und Heimat, 1932. Pp. 97. Rm. 2.50.
- Richard Wagner*. By GUY DE POURTALÈS. New York: Harper, 1932. \$4.00.
- Julius Fröbel. Seine politische Entwicklung bis 1849. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Vormärz*. By ERNST FEUZ. ("Berner Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Geschichte," No. 4.) Berne: Haupt, 1932. Pp. 183. Fr. 6.50.
- Son of the morning*. By EDWARD J. O'BRIEN. New York: Brewer, Warren & Putnam, 1932. \$3.50.
- Friedrich Nietzsche.
- Prinzessin Feodora. Erinnerungen an den Augustenburger und den preussischen Hof. Aus dem bunten Bilderbuch meines Lebens*. By ANNA WAGEMANN. Berlin: Warneck, 1932. Pp. 174. Rm. 5.60.
- Reminiscences of a specialist*. By GREVILLE MACDONALD. London: Allen & Unwin, 1932. 16s.
- The author states that he had it from Sir Morell Mackenzie that "Queen Victoria had said to him that if he could see his way to declaring that the Crown Prince's affliction was not cancer, she would consider herself under personal and lasting obligation to him."
- Wider den Strom. Vom Werden und Wachsen der nationalen Opposition im alten Reich*. By HEINRICH CLASS. Leipzig: Koehler, 1932. Pp. 421. Rm. 6.40.
- By the president of the *Alldeutscher Bund*.
- Die sozialdemokratische Partei in Kiel. Ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung*. By WILHELM BRECOUR. Kiel: Haase, 1932. Pp. 96. Rm. 0.90.
- August Bebel. Geschichte einer politischen Vernunft*. By MAX HOCHDORF. Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1932. Pp. 358. Rm. 5.50.
- Memoirs of Prince Blücher*. Edited by EVELYN PRINCESS BLÜCHER and MAJOR D. CHAPMAN-HUSTON. London: Murray, 1932. 15s.
- An interesting record of Anglo-German friendship, 1865-1931. Prince Blücher was educated at Sandhurst and married an English lady. In 1917 he made an abortive effort for peace as an intermediary in negotiations in which the Englishmen concerned were Lord Buckmaster, Lord Newton, and Sir George Cave.

- Memoirs of Prince von Bülow*. Vol. IV, *Early years and diplomatic service, 1849-1897*. Translated from the German by GEOFFREY DUNLOP and F. A. VOIGT. Boston: Little, Brown, 1932. Pp. 710. \$5.00.
- Denkwürdigkeiten*. By COLMAR FREIHERR VON DER GOLTZ. Edited by FRIEDRICH FREIHERR VON DER GOLTZ and WOLFGANG FOERSTER. Berlin: Mittler, 1932. Pp. 468.
- Der Kaiser: eine Biographie in 107 Bildern*. ("Bilddokumente der Zeit.") Berlin: Tradition, 1933. Pp. 92. Rm. 2.80.
- Aus Wilhelm Liebknechts Jugendjahren: ein Buch vom Werden der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung und der Deutschen Republik*. By ERNST NOBS. Zurich: Genossenschafts-Buchhandlung, 1932. Pp. 128.
- La sociologie économique de Walther Rathenau*. By CH.-G. MOHNEN. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1932. Pp. 270. Fr. 30.
- Grossadmiral von Tirpitz. Flottenbau und Reichsgedanke*. By ADOLF VON TROTHA. Breslau: Korn, 1932. Pp. 181. Rm. 4.50.
- Raum und Volk im Weltkriege: Gedanken über nationale Wehrlehre*. By EWALD BANSE. Oldenburg: Stalling, 1932. Pp. 424. Rm. 4.80.
- Menschen in Not! Kritische Betrachtungen zur Zeitgeschichte 1911-1932*. By WERNER KAUTZSCH. Leipzig: Hartung, 1932. Pp. 352. Rm. 3.50.
- Der Weg Kaiser Wilhelms II. vom Thron in die Fremde*. By ALFRED NIEMANN. Stuttgart: Union, 1932. Pp. 112. Rm. 2.80.
- 1918-19. Die Wehen der Republik*. By WILHELM REINHARD. Berlin: Brunnen-Verlag Bischoff, 1932. Pp. 133. Rm. 2.50.
- Die deutsche Nationalversammlung, 1919-1920*. By W. ZIEGLER. Berlin: Zentralverlag, 1932. Pp. 372. Rm. 12.50.
- Hindenburg der Deutsche*. By WALTER BLOEM. With 57 drawings by ARTHUR KAMPF. Berlin: Hobbing, 1932. Pp. 380. Rm. 11.40.
- Paul von Hindenburg als Mensch, Staatsmann, Feldherr*. By ERICH MARCKS and ERNST VON EISENHART ROTHE. Edited by OSKAR KARSTEDT, for the "Hindenburg-Spende." Berlin: Stollberg, 1932. Pp. 222. Rm. 3.50.

## GREAT BRITAIN

- Le origini della civiltà inglese*. By A. RICCI. Posthumous work edited by A. LAZZARI with an introduction by H. E. GOAD. Florence: Le Monnier, 1932. Pp. xvi+424. L. 25.
- The legal background of the Starrs*. By F. ASHE LINCOLN. Foreword by SIR WILLIAM HOLDSWORTH. London: Edward Goldston, 1932. Pp. 70. 3s.
- The Starrs were Hebrew charters dealing with commercial transactions between Jews and Christians and between Jews and Jews. The author aims to show how English law and social life may have been influenced by Jewish law.
- London for ever. The sovereign city. Its romance and reality*. By COL. ROBERT J. BLACKHAM. London: Sampson Low, 1932. 12s. 6d.
- A history of London*. By ALAN IVIMEY. London: Sampson Low, 1932. 12s. 6d.
- Die Platonische Renaissance in England und die Schule von Cambridge*. By ERNST CASIRER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1932.
- The three pelicans*. By ARTHUR STYRON. New York: Smith & Haas, 1932. \$4.00.
- A fictionalized biography of Thomas Cranmer.
- The rise of the British coal industry, 1550-1700*. By JOHN U. NEF. 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1932. Pp. 448+490. 42s.
- English public finance, 1558-1641*. By FREDERICK C. DIETZ. Published for the American Historical Association. New York: Century, 1932. Pp. 478. \$4.00.

- Sir Humphrey Gilbert*. By DONALD BARR CHIDSEY. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1932. 10s. 6d.
- Tudor sunset*. By MRS. WILFRID WARD. New York: Longmans, Green, 1932. Pp. 353. \$2.00.
- Francis Bacon*. By MARY STURT. New York: Morrow, 1932. \$3.50.
- A treatise of commerce*. By JOHN WHEELER. Reproduced from the London edition of 1601. With a biographical note by GEORGE BURTON HOTCHKISS. For the Facsimile Text Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 125.
- English pulpit oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson: a study of its literary aspects*. By W. FRASER MITCHELL. London: S.P.C.K., 1932. Pp. 516. 21s.
- The homes of the pilgrim fathers in England and America (1620-1685)*. By MARTIN S. BRIGGS. Oxford: University Press, 1932. 18s.
- A beautifully illustrated book showing types of architecture of the homes of famous pilgrims in old and new England.
- The cabinet council of England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 1622-1784*. By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER. Edited by GAUDENCE MEGARO. Vol. II. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1932. Pp. xix+480. \$7.50.
- Charles I: a study*. By F. M. G. HIGHAM. London: Hamilton, 1932. 10s. 6d.
- Wigan's part in the Civil War and in the events which immediately preceded it, 1639-1651*. By ARTHUR JOHN HAWKES. Wigan: Central Public Library, 1932. Pp. 53. 3s.
- The early lives of Milton*. By HELEN DARBISHIRE. London: Constable, 1932. 18s.
- Oliver's secretary: John Milton in an era of revolt*. By DORA NEILL RAYMOND. New York: Minton, Balch, 1932. \$3.50.
- A hundred years of quarter sessions. The government of Middlesex from 1660-1760*. By E. G. DOWDELL. Introduction by WILLIAM HOLDSWORTH, K. C. ("Cambridge studies in English legal history.") Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. 215. 15s.
- Calendar of state papers and manuscripts, relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries of northern Italy*. Vol. XXXIII, 1661-1664. Edited by ALLEN HINDS. London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1932. Pp. 392. 30s.
- William Penn: quaker and pioneer*. By BONAMY DOBREE. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1932. \$4.00.
- The Penns of Pennsylvania and England*. By ARTHUR POUND. London: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 349. 18s.
- Letters and the second diary of Samuel Pepys*. Edited by R. G. HOWARTH. London: Dent, 1932. 7s. 6d.
- Covers seven months, July 30, 1683—March 7, 1683-84, and includes an account of Pepys' expedition to Tangier.
- The life and times of Anthony à Wood*. Edited by LLEWELYN POWERS. London: Wisheart, 1932. 15s.
- The famous Oxford antiquary of the seventeenth century.
- Bishop Berkeley*. By J. M. HONE and M. M. ROSSI. Introduction by W. B. YEATS. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 286. \$4.00.
- The romance of Lloyd's: from coffee-house to palace*. By COMMANDER FRANK WORSLEY, D.S.O., O.B.E., and CAPTAIN GLYN GRIFFITH. London: Hutchinson, 1932. 12s. 6d.
- A picture book of British history*. Compiled by S. C. ROBERTS. Vol. III, 1688-1901. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. 77. 8s. 6d.



- England under Queen Anne.* By GEORGE MACAULAY TREVELYAN. Vol. II, *Ramillies and the union with Scotland.* New York: Longmans, 1932. Pp. 468. \$5.00.
- Bath.* By EDITH SITWELL. New York: Smith & Haas, 1932. \$3.50.  
A descriptive study of the resort in the eighteenth century.
- Made in England.* By SUSAN SMITH. New York: Nelson, 1932. \$2.00.  
English craftsmen in the eighteenth century.
- Oglethorpe. A study of philanthropy in England and Georgia.* By LESLIE F. CHURCH. Foreword by SIR JOSIAH STAMP. London: Epworth, 1932. 7s. 6d.
- David Hume.* By J. Y. T. GREIG. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. \$3.75.
- The Methodist Church: its origin, divisions and reunion.* By A. W. HARRISON, B. AQUILA BARBER, G. G. HORNBY, and E. TEGLA DAVIES. London: Methodist Publishing House, 1932. Pp. 220. 2s. 6d.
- Tours in England and Wales.* By ARTHUR YOUNG. (Selected from the *Annals of Agriculture.*) London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 1932. 7s. 6d.  
Deals with the period 1776-91.
- Mutiny on the Bounty.* By CHARLES NORDHOFF and JAMES NORMAN HALL. Boston: Little, Brown, 1932. Pp. 396. \$2.50.
- Histoire des mutins de la Bounty.* By CHARLES VIDIL. ("Collection historique.") Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 228. Fr. 18.
- The grand social enterprise; a study of Jeremy Bentham in his relation to liberal nationalism.* By ELMER LOUIS KAYSER. ("Studies in history, economics and public law," No. 377.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 109. \$2.00.
- The life of William Beckford.* By J. W. OLIVER. Oxford: University Press, 1932. Pp. 343. 12s. 6d.
- The sailor's Nelson.* By ADMIRAL MARK KERR. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1932. 18s.
- The Nelson collection at Lloyd's.* Edited by WARREN R. DAWSON. London: Macmillan, 1932. 10s.
- The Regent and his daughter.* By DORMER CRESTON. Boston: Little, Brown, 1932. \$3.00.
- William Wilberforce: a champion of freedom.* By WILFRID J. JENKINS. London: Epworth, 1932. Pp. 128. 2s. 6d.
- Lady Louisa Stuart.* By SUSAN BUCHAN. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932. 15s.  
The granddaughter of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and the friend and correspondent of Sir Walter Scott.
- Pugin: a medieval Victorian.* By MICHAEL TRAPPES-LOMAX. London: Sheed & Ward, 1932. Pp. 358. 15s.  
Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin (1812-52), son of a noble Swiss family, an architect who became a leader in the Gothic Revival.
- The great Victorians.* Edited by H. J. and HUGH MASSINGHAM. New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1932. \$3.00.
- At John Murray's: records of a literary circle, 1843-1892.* By GEORGE PASTON. Preface by LORD ERNLE. London: Murray, 1932. 15s.
- Carlyle.* By LOUIS CAZAMIAN. New York: Macmillan, 1932. \$2.75.
- Harriet Martineau: an example of Victorian conflict.* By NAROLA ELIZABETH RIVENBURG. Philadelphia: Author, 1932.
- Jorrocks's England.* By ANTHONY STEEL. London: Methuen, 1932. 7s. 6d.  
The England of the comfortable middle classes, 1840-60, as portrayed in the novels of Robert Smith Surtees.

- The pre-Raphaelite comedy.* By FRANCIS BICKLEY. London: Constable, 1932. Pp. 276. 10s.
- The Victorian morality of art: an analysis of Ruskin's esthetic.* By HENRY LADD. New York: Long & Smith, 1932. Pp. 418. \$3.00.
- Die italienische Renaissance in dem englischen Geistesleben des 19. Jahrhunderts im besondern bei John Ruskin, John Addington Symonds und Vernon Lee.* By EMIL MAX BRÄM. Brugg: Effingerhof, 1932. Pp. 100.
- John Keble.* By LORD IRWIN, K. G. London: Mowbray, 1932. Pp. xi+244. 5s.
- Grace Darling and her times.* By CONSTANCE SMEDLEY (Mrs. Maxwell Armfield). With foreword by COMMANDER STEPHEN KING-HALL. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1932. Pp. 288. 18s.
- Recalling the famous wreck of the "Forfarshire."
- James Stansfeld: a Victorian champion of sex equality.* By J. L. HAMMOND and BARBARA HAMMOND. New York: Longmans, 1932. \$4.00.
- Stansfeld entered the cabinet in 1871 as president of the Bar Law Board; in 1886 he introduced the bill for repealing the Contagious Diseases Act, which represented an attempt to introduce into England the Continental method of regulating prostitution.
- Lightfoot of Durham: memories and appreciations.* Collected and edited by GEORGE R. EDEN, D.D., and F. C. MACDONALD. Cambridge: University Press, 1932. Pp. 192. 7s. 6d.
- The Victorian sunset.* By ESMÉ WINGFIELD-STRATFORD. London: Routledge, 1932. Pp. 396. 12s. 6d.
- The life of Joseph Chamberlain.* By J. L. GARVIN. Vol. I, 1836-1885: *Chamberlain and democracy.* New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 624. \$5.00.
- Phil May: master-draughtsman and humorist, 1864-1903.* By JAMES THORPE. London: Harrap, 1932. Pp. 211. 30s.
- A Victorian childhood.* By ANNABEL HUTH JACKSON (née GRANT DUFF). London: Methuen, 1932. 6s.
- Life of Herbert Henry Asquith, Lord Oxford and Asquith.* By J. A. SPENDER and CYRIL ASQUITH. 2 vols. London: Hutchinson, 1932. Pp. 801. 36s.
- Herbert Gladstone: a memoir.* By SIR CHARLES MALLET. London: Hutchinson, 1932. Pp. 326. 18s.
- Pre-war.* By EARL WINTERTON. London: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 313. 10s. 6d.
- Recollections of a distinguished Conservative politician.
- Amid these storms: thoughts and adventures.* By the RT. HON. WINSTON S. CHURCHILL, C.H., M.P. New York: Scribner's, 1932. Pp. 320. \$3.50.
- In this volume of papers Mr. Churchill lets himself go with great verve on a variety of subjects. A vivid description of the "Battle of Sidney Street" recalls a long-forgotten episode. Eight essays deal with the Great War; those on "The U-boat war" and "The Dover barrage" are very instructive, and "A day with Clemenceau" affords an astonishing picture not only of the "Tiger's" demonic energy but also of Foch's extraordinary personality and methods. The chapter on "The Irish treaty" is worth reading; likewise the essay on "consistency in politics," which has not been regarded as one of the author's characteristics. Naturally, after a life so full of experience, Mr. Churchill has many excellent stories to tell. His book makes a pleasant footnote to the history of our troubled times.
- Politicians and the war, 1914-1916.* By LORD BEAVERBROOK. Vol. II. London: Lane, 1932. Pp. 349. 7s. 6d.
- The strange case of Andrew Bonar Law.* By H. A. TAYLOR. London: Paul, 1932. Pp. 284. 18s.

*Lord Thomson of Cardington: a memoir and some letters.* By PRINCESS MARTHE BIBESCO. London: Cape, 1932. Pp. 237. 7s. 6d.

Charles Birdwood Thomson, a disillusioned British general, who joined the Labour party, became minister of air, was made a peer, and died in the crash of the "R 101."

*The journals of Arnold Bennett.* Vol. II, 1911-1920. New York: Viking Press, 1932. Pp. 342. \$4.00.

Though primarily of literary interest, these *Journals* have much to say about life in England during the war. In 1918 Bennett joined the propaganda department of the ministry of information.

*As we are: a modern revue.* By E. F. BENSON. London: Longmans, 1932. 15s.

A sequel to *As we were: a Victorian peepshow.*

*Memoirs of an architect.* By SIR REGINALD BLOOMFIELD, R.A. London: Macmillan, 1932. 10s. 6d.

*Winfred Burrows, 1858-1929.* By MARY MOORE (his daughter). London: S.P.C.K., 1932. Pp. 163. 5s.

After gaining four Firsts at Oxford, he took orders and ultimately became bishop of Truro.

*Lipton's autobiography.* New York: Duffield & Green, 1932. \$2.50.

*Evening memories.* By THE RIGHT HON. SIR HERBERT MAXWELL. London: MacLehose, 1932. Pp. 366. 16s.

*My world as in my time, 1862-1932.* Memoirs of SIR HENRY NEWBOLT. London: Faber & Faber, 1932. 18s.

*Sir William Orpen: artist and man.* By P. G. KONODY and SIDNEY DARK. London: Seeley Service, 1932. 25s.

*My own way. An autobiography.* By HIS HONOUR SIR EDWARD PARRY. London: Cassell, 1932. Pp. 320. 15s.

In addition to a distinguished legal career, the author rediscovered Dorothy Osborne and published the first edition of her letters.

*Recollections of a prison governor.* By LIEUTENANT-COLONEL C. E. F. RICH. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1932. 18s.

From 1902 to the present.

*A yellow admiral remembers.* By VICE-ADMIRAL HUMPHREY HUGH SMITH. London: Arnold, 1932. Pp. 360. 12s. 6d.

*Forty years of Uppingham: memories and sketches.* By JOHN P. GRAHAM. London: Macmillan, 1932. 6s.

*A short history of Scotland, from the earliest times to the outbreak of the World War.* By GEORGE MALCOLM THOMSON. London: Kegan Paul, 1932. Pp. 318. 6s.

*The Scottish queen.* By HERBERT GORMAN. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, 1932. Pp. 605. \$4.00.

Mary Stuart.

*Memorials of Sir Gideon Murray of Elibank and his times (1560-1621).* By LT.-COL. HON. ARTHUR C. MURRAY. Preface by COL. JOHN BUCHAN. Edinburgh: George Street, 1932. Pp. 196. 7s. 6d.

*Bonnie Prince Charlie.* By CLENNELL WILKINSON. London: Harrap, 1932. Pp. 247. 8s. 6d.

*A shipbuilding history, 1750-1932: a record of the business, founded about 1750 by Alexander Stephen at Burghead, and subsequently carried on at Aberdeen, Arbroath, Dundee, and Glasgow.* Barrow: Alexander Stephen & Sons, 1932. Pp. 212.

*The Scottish National War Memorial.* With an introduction by GENERAL SIR IAN HAMILTON. Edinburgh: Grant and Murray, 1932. Pp. 64. 15s.

A collection of photographs.

## IRELAND

*The life of John Redmond.* By DENIS GWYNN. London: Harrap, 1932. Pp. 611. 25s.

*With De Valera in America.* By PATRICK MCCARTAN. New York: Brentano's, 1932. \$3.00.

## ITALY

*Guida storica e bibliografia degli archivi e biblioteche d'Italia.* Directed by L. SCHIAPARELLI for the R. ISTITUTO STORICO ITALIANO. Vol. I, *Provincia di Firenze.* Part I, *Prato.* Edited by R. PIATTOLI. Rome: Libreria dello Stato, 1932. Pp. 179. L. 12.

*Bibliografia sarda.* By R. CIASCA under the auspices of the R. UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI CAGLIARI. Vol. II. Rome: Collezione meridionale, 1932. Pp. 572. L. 30.

*Enciclopedia storico-nobiliare italiana.* By V. SPRETI. Vol. V, (*Lettere P-Q-R*). Milan: Enciclopedia Storico-Nobiliare Italiana, 1932. Pp. 998.

*Florentine merchants in the age of the Medici: letters and documents from the Selfridge collection of Medici manuscripts.* By GERTRUDE RANDOLPH BRAMLETTE RICHARDS. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 342. \$4.50.

*Una sacrilega faida bergamasca del cinquecento.* By B. BELOTTI. Milan: Archivio storico lombardo, 1932. Pp. 109.

*Die Renaissance. Italien.* By GEORG VOIGT. Berlin: Aretz, 1932. Pp. 342. Rm. 3.80.

*Rome of the Renaissance and to-day.* By SIR RENNELL RODD. London: Macmillan, 1932. 25s.

A comparative guidebook.

*The story of the Borgias.* By L. COLLISON-MORLEY. London: Routledge, 1932. Pp. 329. 12s. 6d.

The author endeavors to hold the balance between whitewash and denunciation.

*De pestilentia quae Mediolani anno 1630 magnam stragem edidit.* By CARD. F. BORROMEO. An unpublished manuscript of the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Edited by A. SABA. ("Collana Federiciana.") Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana, 1932. Pp. 44.

*La vita e l'opera dell'Avv. Angelo Maria de Stoppani, con numerosi documenti inediti, 1768-1815.* By N. E. GREPPI. ("Figure del Risorgimento Ticinese.") Bellinzona: Leins & Vescovi, 1932. Pp. 91.

*Il decurionato de Napoli, 1807-1861.* By A. CUTOLO. ("Documenti e monografie di storia comunale napoletana.") Naples: The city government, 1932. Pp. 197.

*Das Leben des italienischen Freiheitsdichters Silvio Pellico (1789-1854).* By HÉLÈNE RITTER. Zurich: Rascher, 1932. Pp. 120. Fr. 5.

*La question romaine de Pie VI à Pie IX.* By G. MOLLAT. ("Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique.") Paris: Gabalda, 1932. Pp. 469. Fr. 24.

*Luciano Manara. (Fondazione del Corpo dei Bersaglieri, 1836. Cinque giornate de Milano, 1848. Garibaldi e l'eroica difesa di Roma, 1849).* By E. VIARANA. Milan: Rosio, 1932. Pp. 136. L. 40.

*Cavour.* By A. CAPPA. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna.") Bari: Laterza, 1932. Pp. 478. L. 30.

*Cavour.* By ALFREDO PANZINI. ("Collection historique.") Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 312. Fr. 24.

*Garibaldi nella sua epoca.* By A. BIZZONI. Milan: Sonzogno, 1932. Pp. 1352. L. 40.

*Lo sbarco de Garibaldi a Magnavacca.* By N. BONNET. Bologna: Stabilimenti poligrafici riuniti, 1932. Pp. 133. L. 7.

- Garibaldi e Livorno*. By A. CRISTOFANINI. Leghorn: Giusti, 1932. Pp. 263. L. 10.  
*Edizione nazionale degli scritti di Giuseppe Garibaldi*. Published by the SOCIETÀ NAZIONALE PER LA STORIA DEL RISORGIMENTO ITALIANO. Bologna: Cappelli, 1932.
- Morte de Anita Garibaldi*. By G. FABBRINI. Milan: Bietti, 1932. Pp. 108. L. 6.
- L'azione del colonnello Nino Bonnet nel trafugamento di Garibaldi dalla Pralazza alla fattoria Guiccioli (3-4 agosto 1849)*. By A. PATRIGNANI. Faenza: Lega, 1932. Pp. 78. L. 7.
- Nuove ricerche sulla rivoluzione del 1860*. By G. MISTRETTA DI PAOLA. Part I, *Documenti*. Alcamo: La Folgore, 1932. Pp. 21. L. 2.
- Maggio 1860*. Page of an unpublished *taccuino* [memorandum] by G. C. ABBA. Edited by G. BANDINI. Milan: Mondadori, 1932. L. 12.
- Mazzini, Garibaldi e i moti del 1863-1864 nella Venezia*. By G. SOLITRO. ("Pubblicazioni della R. Accademia de Scienze, Lettere e Arti in Padova.") Padua: Penada, 1932. Pp. 123.
- A number of rare, hitherto unpublished, documents are included.
- Da Adua alla Bainsizza e a Vittorio Veneto*. By ALBERTO LUMBROSO. Genoa: Rivista di Roma, 1932. Pp. 572.
- Discorsi*. By P. BOSELLI. Vol. I, *Discorsi politici e civili*. Collected and annotated by A. BIANCOTTI. Vol. II, *Discorsi per la "Dante Alighieri"*. Collected and annotated by A. SEVERINO. Vol. III, *Discorsi storici e commemorativi*. Collected and annotated by A. SCALISE. Turin: Chiantore, 1932. Pp. 272+276+316. L. 30.

## LOW COUNTRIES

- Willem, Prince van Oranje. Een heldenfiguur uit den grootschen vrijheidskamp der Nederlanden tegen de Spaansche overheersching*. By JEF VAN EYCK. Merksem: Deurnesteenweg, 1932. Pp. 55.
- Reisebeschreibungen von deutschen Beamten und Kriegersleuten im Dienst der niederländischen West- und Ost-Indischen Kompagnien, 1602-1797*. Edited by S. P. L'HONORÉ NABER. Vols. XII-XIII. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1932. Gld. 35.20.
- The pilgrim fathers from a Dutch point of view*. By D. PLOOIJ. New York: New York University Press, 1932. Pp. xi+154.
- Six interesting and scholarly lectures delivered at New York University on the general subject of Dutch influence on America, including John Robinson and religious freedom, William Brewster and the Pilgrim Press, and the influence of the University of Leyden on America through the first American students.
- The brush-work of Rembrandt and his school*. By A. P. LAURIE. Oxford: University Press, 1932. 105s.
- William of Orange*. By G. J. RENIER, PH.D. London: Peter Davies, Ltd., 1932. Pp. 170. 5s.

This book appears in a series of popular and fairly brief biographies of famous personages. The reader, therefore, should not be surprised by the total lack of footnotes in Renier's work, or by the limited scope of his biography. Since it has obviously been based on the researches of Dr. N. Japikse and Professor P. Geyl, it contains no glaring errors or untrustworthy interpretations.

Perhaps the title of the book will prove confusing to readers on the European continent, for in the history of the United Netherlands the ruler who is commonly called William of Orange was not William III, the subject of Renier's study, but William the Silent, or William I, the great-grandfather of King William III. It is interesting to note that simultaneously with the new life of William III a biography of William the Silent appeared in Holland, entitled *Willem van Oranje* and written by A. den Hertog.

The biography by Renier is in many respects inferior to Traill's *William the Third*, although it is more accurate than the latter. Traill resembled Motley in his ability to

arouse attention and enthusiasm on the part of his readers. Renier's book, on the other hand, is dull and far from inspiring. It can scarcely be called a contribution to historical literature; its chief merit consists in having made accessible to English readers some of the results of the excellent work done by Japikse and Geyl.

A. HYMA

*Correspondentie van de stadhouderlijke Familie, 1777-1795.* Edited by JOHANNA W. A. NABER. 2 vols. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1932. Pp. xxxv+243; iv+258. Gld. 9.

Written in French and dealing mainly with family matters.

*Geschiedenis van de handelspolitieke Betrekkingen tusschen Nederland en Engeland in de negentiende Eeuw (1814-1872).* By A. DE VRIES. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1932. Gld. 4.80.

*Thorbecke.* By DR. I. J. BRUGMANS. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger, 1932. Gld. 1.90.  
An important statesman of the nineteenth century.

*Histoire économique et sociale de la Belgique depuis les origines jusqu'en 1914.* By LAURENT DECHESNE. Paris: Recueil Sirey, 1932. Pp. 527.

*Histoire militaire des Belges.* By CHARLES TERLINDEN. Brussels: Renaissance du Livre, 1932. Pp. 331.

*Bruges, séjour d'exil des rois d'Angleterre Édouard IV (1471) et Charles II (1656-1658).*  
By ARMAND DE BEHAULT DE DORNON. 3 vols. Bruges: Verbeke-Loys, 1931. Pp. 481.

*Histoire de l'Ordre souverain et militaire de Saint-Jean de Jérusalem dit de Rhodes ou de Malte en Belgique.* By GEORGES DANSAERT. Paris: Librairie nationale d'art et d'histoire, 1932. Pp. 452. Fr. 325.

*War memories.* By PRINCESSE MARIE DE CROY. London: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. 310.

#### NEAR EAST

*Bibliographie balkanique 1931-1932.* Edited by LÉON SAVADJIAN. Introduction by MAURICE MURET. Paris: Revue des Balkans, 1932. Fr. 50.

*My life in the Moslem East.* By EMMA COCHRAN PONAFLDINE (MME PIERRE PONAFLDINE). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1932. \$3.50.

The daughter of American missionaries, who married a Russian and lived in Bagdad, Tashkent, Meshed, and Constantinople.

*Bloody years.* By FRANCIS YEATS-BROWN. New York: Viking Press, 1932. \$2.75.

Intrigue and revolution under Abdul-Hamid II.

*Die verfassungsrechtliche und politische Struktur des rumänischen Staates.* By ERNST SCHMIDT. Munich: Reinhardt, 1932. Pp. 156. Rm. 5.50.

A historical study.

*La Bulgarie de 1912 à 1930.* By H. PROST. Paris: Roger, 1932. Fr. 15.

#### POLAND AND THE BALTIC STATES

*Walka o wolność i potege Polski.* By W. KWIATKOWSKI. Lwow, 1932. Pp. 199.

Poland's struggle for independence since 1863.

*Walka zbrojna o niepodległość Polski.* By W. LIPINSKI. Warsaw, 1931. Pp. 444.

Poland's struggle for independence, 1905-18.

*La Silésie polonaise.* Paris: Gebethner & Wolff, 1932. Pp. 328.

A collection of addresses by French and Polish scholars, including a detailed study of the plebiscite by Casimir Smorzewski.

*Wings over Poland. The story of the 7th (Kosciuszko) Squadron of the Polish Air Service. 1919, 1920, 1921.* By KENNETH MALCOLM MURRAY. New York: Appleton, 1932. Pp. x+363. \$3.00.

It may be admitted without equivocation that Mr. Murray writes entertainingly and accomplishes what is clearly his primary purpose: to memorialize the exploits of the Kosciuszko Squadron, a group of American wartime-aviators who took service with Poland in her brief war of 1919-20 with the Soviet Union. The work is certainly not for the historian and, to do the author justice, was probably not so intended. Nevertheless, in the hands of the uncritical reader it might easily lead to many false impressions, and for this reason one cannot help expressing regret at the writer's failure to probe more carefully into the historical past before delivering his judgments. A juster appreciation of the issues and forces involved in the Polish-Soviet imbroglio would have undoubtedly resulted. Mr. Murray, for instance, swallows in one gulp the thriving Polish legend that the historical rôle of Poland has been the saving of Western civilization from the ever-recurring invasions emanating from the barbarian East. Under his careless, perfervid pen, Kosciuszko's countrymen again emerge as the gallant Christian people who once more sacrifice themselves in glad obedience to their heavenly mission, while the Russians appear as fiends incarnate, a blood-thirsty, crazed lot of godless Mongols who seek to destroy all that is good and fine in occidental life. Thus we are prepared to understand why the Battle of Warsaw of the year 1920 is the "eighteenth decisive battle of the world," and why Poland, whose people have been "free and equal since before the Crusades," as a result of her great victory saves herself (and, by inference, Europe also) from a "bondage more terrible than any ever before known—the bondage of Bolshevism, the bondage of class war never ending, the bondage of a curse engendered by the peasants themselves: the most awful misery of body and spirit known since the beginning of the world—the hell and turmoil of a man cursing himself." And so on, *ad infinitum*. The reviewer has only one final comment: read this work—and be mystified forevermore.

JOSEPH SIDNEY WERLIN

*Pokój Ryski.* By J. DABSKI. Warsaw, 1931. Pp. 214.

Recollections and documents concerning the Treaty of Riga between Poland and Russia.

*Medžiaga Vilniaus ginčo diplomatinei istorijai.* By J. URBŠYS. Kaunas, 1932.

Materials for a history of the Vilna dispute.

*The city of the Red plague: Soviet rule in a Baltic town.* By GEORGE POPOFF. Translated by ROBIN JOHN. New York: Dutton, 1932.

A sketch of events in Riga, 1917-18, by one who saw them through. The author is the son of a former tsarist general.

*Die materielle Kultur der Esten.* By FERDINAND LEINBOCK. Tartu: Akadeemiline Kooperatiiv, 1932. Pp. 112.

*Ett halot ar som Finlands första utrikesminister.* By O. STEUROTH. Helsingfors, 1931. Pp. 243.

Reminiscences by a former Finnish foreign minister of the founding of the state.

#### RUSSIA

*Histoire de Russie.* By PAUL MILIOUKOV, CH. SEIGNOBOS, and L. EISENMANN. Vol. I, *Des origines à la mort de Pierre le Grand.* Paris: Leroux, 1932. Pp. xix+440. Fr. 60.

*Histoire de la marine russe.* By N. MONASTEREV and SERGE TERESTCHENKO. Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 352. Fr. 30.

*A history of the Georgian people: from the beginning down to the Russian conquest in the nineteenth century.* By W. E. D. ALLEN. Introduction by SIR DENISON ROSS. London: Kegan Paul, 1932. Pp. xxiv+429. 31s. 6d.

*A cavalier in Muscovy.* By BARONESS SOPHIE BUXHOEVEDEN. London: Macmillan, 1932. 15s.

This life of Patrick Gordon (1635-99), the Scottish officer who became commander-in-chief of the army of Peter the Great, is an interesting contribution to the social history of Eastern Europe in the seventeenth century.

*Baron Brambeus.* By V. KAVERIN. Moscow: Federatsia, 1932.

Joseph Senkovsky (1800-1858), a Pole, became a professor in the University of St. Petersburg at the age of twenty-two, but later, as "Baron Brambeus," established *The reader's library*, which was the most successful periodical of the thirties and forties.

*Studie o F. M. Dostojevském (s rukopisnými poznámkami).* By T. G. MASARYK. Arranged by Jiří HORÁK. ("Prameny k dějinám vzájemných styků slovanských," Vol. I.) Prague: Orbis, 1932. Pp. 84.

A critical re-edition of Masaryk's article, written in 1892, on Dostoyevski's philosophy. The editor, Jiří Horak, accounts for the president's interest in Dostoyevski on the ground that the thought of this Russian novelist and poet had closely identified itself with Masaryk's own views of the Slavic spiritual mission in the world.

*Under czar and soviet: my thirty years in Russia.* By JOHN WYNNE HIRD. Foreword by ALEXANDER KERENSKY. London: Hurst & Blackett, 1932. Pp. 287. 12s. 6d.

*Geschichte des Bolschewismus.* By ARTHUR ROSENBERG. Berlin: Rowohlt, 1932. Pp. 239. Rm. 4.80.

Bolshevism from Karl Marx to the present.

*Auf dem Wege zum Bolschewismus: Aufzeichnungen eines russischen Ingenieurs aus der Zeit vor und während des Weltkrieges.* By NIKOLAI A. STANKOFF. Translated from the Russian by ELISABETH HENTZELT. Munich: Reinhardt, 1933. Pp. 371. Rm. 3.75.

*The bolsheviks in the tsarist duma.* By A. BADAYEV. New York: International Publishers, 1932. \$2.25.

*The arena.* The autobiography of SHMARYA LEVIN. London: Routledge, 1932. 10s. 6d. Russian Jewry under the last tsars.

*Memoirs of a British agent: being an account of the author's early life in many lands and of his official mission to Moscow in 1918.* By R. H. BRUCE LOCKHART. London: Putnam, 1932. Pp. 355. 9s.

Russia seen from the inside, 1912-18.

*The cost of the war to Russia. The vital statistics of European Russia during the World War, 1914-17.* By STANISLAS KOHN. *Social cost of the war.* By BARON ALEXANDER F. MEYENDORFF. ("Economic and social history of the World War, Russian series.") New Haven: Yale University Press, 1932. Pp. 219. \$3.25.

*Das Ende des kaiserlich russischen Heeres.* By LELIO GRAF SPANNOCCI. Prepared from Russian and other official source material. Leipzig: Elbemühl, 1932. Pp. 229. Rm. 5.

*Lances down.* By RICHARD BOLESŁAVSKI in collaboration with HELEN WOODWARD. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1932. \$3.00.

The Moscow Art Theatre in 1917.

*Banditi, carnefici e soldati: Russia 1917-1919.* By R. MALLECZEWEW. Milan: Marangoni, 1932. Pp. 264. L. 10.

*Istoriya Ukrainy, 1917-1923 gg.* By D. DOROSHENKO. Uzhorod: Nakladom Dra Osypa Cupky, 1932. Pp. 458.

A history of the Ukraine in the days of the Central Rada.



- Days with Lenin.* By MAXIM GORKY. New York: International Publishers, 1932. \$0.75.
- Lénine.* By F. A. OSSENDOWSKI. Paris: Michel, 1932. Pp. 448. Fr. 20.
- Grashdanskaya vojn.* By A. V. GOLUBEV. Moscow: Gosizdat, 1932. Pp. 221.  
A history of the civil war and the counter-revolution.
- Erinnerungen eines Arbeiterrevolutionärs.* By ALEKSANDR SIDORVIČ ŠAPOVALOV. Vol. II, *Illegal.* Translated from the Russian by OLGA HALPERN. ("Internationale Memoiren," Vol. IV.) Berlin: Mopr, 1932. Pp. 376. Rm. 3.25.
- Unter Doppeladler und Sowjetstern: Streiflichter aus Krieg und Gefangenschaft.* By HERMANN APPEL. Jägerndorf, Czechoslovakia: Rieger, 1932. Pp. 194.

## SCANDINAVIA

- Denmark and the Danes.* By ETHEL CARLETON WILLIAMS. London: Methuen, 1932. Pp. 242. 7s. 6d.  
The author's theme is old Denmark and the great relics and memorials of the past.
- Gustav Adolf und die Grundlagen der schwedischen Macht.* By OTTO WESTPHAL. Hamburg: Hanseatische Verlag-Anstalt, 1932. Pp. 157. Rm. 6.20.
- Nansen.* By E. E. REYNOLDS. London: Bles, 1932. Pp. 274. 10s. 6d.
- The saga of Fridtjof Nansen.* By JON SORENSON. Translated by J. B. C. WATKINS. New York: Norton, 1932. Pp. 372. \$4.50.

## SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

- Histoire d'Espagne.* By LOUIS BERTRAND. Paris: Fayard, 1932. Fr. 16.50.
- El Greco and Cervantes.* By HANS ROSENCRAZ. New York: McBride, 1932. \$2.50.
- De Renaissance in Spanje.* By G. J. GEERS. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme, 1932.
- Infantas lusitanas, reinas de Espana e infantas espanolas reinas de Portugal.* By ANA DE LANCASTRE-LABOREIRO. Cáceres: Moderna, 1931. Pp. 159. Pes. 6.
- Anales secretos de la Inquisición española. Memoria histórica sobre la Inquisición española.* By JUAN ANTONIO LORENTE. Madrid: Librería Bergua, 1932. Pp. 214. Pes. 2.
- The other Spanish Christ: a study in the spiritual history of Spain and South America.* By JOHN A. MACKAY. London: Student Movement Press, 1932. 9s.
- St. John of the Cross.* By FR. BRUNO, O.D.C. Edited by FR. BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN, O.D.C. London: Sheed and Ward, 1932. 18s.  
A Carmelite of the golden age of Spain.
- Historia del Almirante D. Cristóbal Colón por su hijo.* By HERNANDO COLÓN. Vol. II. ("Colección de libros raros o curiosos que tratan de América," 1st series, Vol. VI.) Madrid: Suárez, 1932. Pp. 442. Pes. 10.
- Cartas de relación de la conquista de México.* By HERNÁN CORTES. Vols. I and II. 2d ed. ("Viajes clásicos.") Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. Pp. 240, 248. Pes. 8.
- Pedro de Alvarado, conquistador.* By JOHN EOGHAN KELLY. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1932. \$3.50.
- La crónica del Perú.* By PEDRO CIEZA DE LEÓN. 2d ed. ("Virjes clásicos.") Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. Pp. 340. Pes. 5.
- Le commerce français à Séville et Cadix au temps des Habsbourg.* By ALBERT GIRARD. ("Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études hispaniques," No. 18.) Paris: Boccard, 1932. Pp. xxiv+607. Fr. 50.
- La rivalité commerciale et maritime entre Séville et Cadix jusqu'à la fin du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle.* By ALBERT GIRARD. ("Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études hispaniques," No. 17.) Paris: Boccard, 1932. Pp. 120. Fr. 18.

*Carlos VII, duque de Madrid.* By CONDE DE RODEZNO. 2d ed. ("Vidas españolas e hispano-americanas del siglo XIX," Vol. IV.) Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1932. Pp. 263. Pes. 5.

*El régimen parlamentario en la práctica.* By GUMERSINDO DE AZCÁRATE. Madrid: Miguel Servet, 1932. Pes. 5.

Azcárate represented León in the Cortes from 1868 to 1917 and was an untiring defender of constitutional practice and parliamentary action. This book was written in 1885.

*Proceso histórico de la constitución de la República española.* By LUIS JIMÉNEZ DE ASÚA. Madrid: Reus, 1932. Pp. 527. Pes. 10.

*Early Portuguese books, 1489-1600, in the library of His Majesty the King of Portugal.* Described by H. M. KING MANUEL. Vol. III, 1540-1569. London: Maggs Bros., 1932.

*The Harkness Collection in the Library of Congress. Calendar of Spanish manuscripts concerning Peru, 1531-1651.* Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1932. Pp. x+335. \$3.25.

*Fall of the Inca Empire and the Spanish rule in Peru: 1530-1780.* By PHILIP AINSWORTH MEANS. New York: Scribner's, 1932. Pp. xii+351. \$4.50.

The director and staff of the Library of Congress are to be congratulated for the splendid work done in making available this beautifully printed calendar of manuscripts comprised in the Harkness collection, which contains 1030 documents. Edward S. Harkness spent a fortune in acquiring the collection, and historical scholars may well rejoice at the generosity that now makes this treasure available. The only other comparable set of Peruvian manuscripts is that owned by Senator Hiram Bingham at Yale University. For the fine printing, form, and arrangement of the *Calendar* we are indebted to Miss Stella R. Clemence. The documents are listed in chronological order, and each item carries a short explanatory paragraph. The *Calendar*, supplemented by Mr. Means's book, should prove indispensable to the student.

In the *Fall of the Inca Empire* Mr. Means has maintained the high standard of scholarship which he set for himself in *Ancient civilization of the Andes*. In the first four chapters of the present work, he continues the story of the Peruvian peoples to the opening of the vice-regal period. The rest of the book deals with Spanish institutions and, though interesting to the historical student, may prove a bit heavy for the uninitiated. Undoubtedly Mr. Means is a master of the subject and has a thorough knowledge of the country. That he is well acquainted with his sources is also evident from the fine notes at the end of each chapter, which taken as a whole comprise quite a bibliography. The book is also furnished with a bibliographical list of the best works and manuscripts on the subject. The fact that Mr. Means makes it clear that he is partial to Incaic institutions may in some cases make his findings seem somewhat novel to friends of European civilization. Nevertheless, those who are well acquainted with the native races of America will find his statements fundamentally correct.

GEORGE TAYS

#### SWITZERLAND

*Geschichte der Schweiz.* By HANS NABHOLZ, LEONHARD VON MURALT, RICHARD FELLER, and EMIL DÜRR. Vol. I, *Von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ausgang des XVI. Jahrhunderts.* Zurich: Schulthess, 1932. Pp. 525. Fr. 33.

*Geschichte der Landschaft Basel und des Kantons Basellandschaft.* Prepared by KARL GAUSS, et al., for the government of the canton of Basel. 2 vols. Liestal: Lüdlin in Komm., 1932. Pp. 870+787. Fr. 32.

*Luzerner Bilderchronik, 1513. Zur Jahrhundertfeier des Eintrittes Luzerns in den Bund der Eidgenossen.* By DIEBOLD SCHILLING. Edited by DR. ROBERT DURRER and DR. PAUL HILBER. Geneva: Sadag, 1932. Pp. 216.

- Luzerns ewiger Bund mit der urschweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft, 1332-1932.* By CARL MEYER. Lucerne: Haag, 1932. Pp. 78. Fr. 1.20.
- Die Knabenschaften Graubündens. Eine volkskundlich-kulturhistorische Studie.* By DR. GIAN CADUFF. Chur: Schuler in Komm., 1932. Pp. 256. Rm. 4.
- Die Eidgenossenschaft und der Kaiserhof zur Zeit Ferdinands II. und Ferdinands III. 1619-1657. Geschichte der formellen Lostrennung der Schweiz vom deutschen Reich im Westfälischen Frieden.* By FRIEDA GALLATI. Zurich: Leemann, 1932. Pp. 395.
- Der schweizer Bauer im Zeitalter des Frühkapitalismus. Die Wandlung der schweizer Bauernwirtschaft im 18. Jahrhundert und die Politik der ökonomischen Patrioten.* By GEORG C. L. SCHMIDT. Vol. I, *Überblick*. Vol. II, *Quellenmässige Darstellung*. Berne: Haupt, 1932. Pp. 180+333. Fr. 15.
- Alps and men.* G. R. DE BEER. New York: Longmans, 1932. \$5.00.  
Switzerland, 1750-1850, as seen in tourists' diaries.
- La prise d'armes de 1782 à Genève.* By ÉDOUARD CHAPUISAT. Published by the SOCIÉTÉ D'HISTOIRE ET D'ARCHÉOLOGIE DE GENÈVE. Geneva: Jullien, 1932. Pp. 236. Fr. 6.
- Der Geist der helvetischen Gesellschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts, besonders zwischen 1807 und 1849. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Liberalismus in der Schweiz.* By OTTO ZINNIKER. Biel: Andres, 1932. Pp. 113.
- Jean Huber-Saladin, 1798-1881. Un genevois cosmopolite ami de Lamartine. Le mondain—le diplomate—l'écrivain.* By CHARLES FOURNET. ("Bibliothèque de la revue de littérature comparée," Vol. LXXXIII.) Paris: Champion, 1932. Pp. 349. Fr. 45.
- Karl Heinzen (1809-1880): seine politische Entwicklung und publizistische Wirksamkeit.* By HANS HUBER. ("Berner Untersuchungen zur allgemeinen Geschichte," No. 6.) Leipzig: Haupt, 1932. Pp. 107. Rm. 2.80.
- Arnold Künzli, 1832-1908: ein schweizerischer Volks- und Staatsmann. Gedenkblatt zur Weihe seines Denkmals in Aarau und Murgenthal.* By OTTO HUNZIKER. Aarau: Sauerländer, 1932. Pp. 86.
- L'annexion de la Savoie à la France et la politique suisse, 1860.* By LUC MONNIER. Geneva: Jullien, 1932. Pp. 415.

## AFRICA

- Les relations de la France et du Maroc pendant la conquête d'Algérie.* By PHILIPPE DE COSSÉ-BRISSAC. Paris: Larose, 1932. Pp. 176. Fr. 30.
- Bula Matari: Stanley, conqueror of a continent.* By JACOB WASSERMANN. Translated by EDEN and CEDAR PAUL. New York: Liveright, 1933. Pp. 337. \$3.00.  
A famous novelist tries his hand at biography.

## ASIA

- Persia.* By SIR ARNOLD T. WILSON. ("Modern world series.") London: Ernest Benn, 1932. Pp. 400. 21s.
- The Indian ocean.* By STANLEY ROGERS. London: Harrap, 1932. Pp. 254. 7s. 6d.  
An account of early discoverers, traders, pirates, and German cruisers.
- Albuquerque.* By RENÉ BOUVIER. Paris: Champion, 1932. Pp. 150. Fr. 10.
- Imperial farmans (A.D. 1577 to A.D. 1805) granted to the ancestors of his Holiness the Tikayat Maharaj.* Translated into English, Hindi, and Gujarati, with notes, by KRISHNALAL MOHANLAL JHAVERI. Bombay: Girgaon Post, 1932.  
Photographic reproductions of seventeen farmans granted to the head of the Valabha sect of Vaishnavas, which show how benevolently the earlier Mogul emperors regarded the religious leaders of the Hindu world.

*Mémoires de François Martin, fondateur de Pondichéry (1665-1694)*. Edited by A. MARTINEAU. Vol. II. Paris: Société d'éditions géographiques, maritimes et coloniales. 1932. Pp. xxxii+600. Fr. 75.

*Les aventuriers français aux Indes de 1775 à 1820*. By MAURICE BESSON. ("Collection historique.") Paris: Payot, 1932. Pp. 256. Fr. 20.

#### FAR EAST

*The vision of Asia: an interpretation of Chinese art and culture*. By L. CRANMER-BYNG. London: Murray, 1932. 15s.

*China yesterday and today*. By EDWARD THOMAS WILLIAMS. 5th edition, revised. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1932. Pp. xxiv+743. \$4.00.

A standard work for the general reader, combining in highly interesting fashion a sympathetic and excellently organized portrayal of Chinese civilization with a smoothly-written, though all too brief, résumé of China's domestic and foreign politics, is here brought up to date. A new map is provided showing China's new provinces. Somewhat unexpectedly, in view of the author's deprecation of recent Japanese acts of aggression, "Manchukuo" is prominently demarcated in red and named without quotation marks. Concerning the creation of the puppet state Dr. Williams writes (p. 644 n.): "Such occupation of a portion of the territory of China and the establishment there of an independent government was plainly not only an act of war, but was also in violation of all the numerous treaties and agreements signed by Japan promising to respect the territorial integrity of China."

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY

*China through the ages*. By MRS. ALFRED WINGATE. London: Crosby Lockwood, 1932. Pp. 252. 7s. 6d.

*The origin and development of the state cult of Confucius*. By JOHN K. SHRYOCK, PH.D. Published for the American Historical Association. New York: Century, 1932. Pp. 298. \$4.00.

*Del Tormes al río Azul. Diario misionero de la primera expedición de Hijos de Jesús a la China*. By MARÍA MARCOS MAESTRE. Salamanca: Cuesta, 1932. Pp. 118. Pes. 3.50.

*Evolutionist and missionary, John Thomas Gulick, portrayed through documents and discussions*. By ADDISON GULICK. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. 556. \$4.00.

A Hawaiian who became a missionary in China and Japan.

*Zur Politik der Grossmächte im Fernen Osten 1894-1902. Eine Studie zur Erklärung der Vorgänge der Gegenwart*. By DR. HEINRICH DAVID. Zurich: Rascher, 1932. Pp. 73.

*Nationalism and education in modern China*. By CYRUS H. PEAKE. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

#### THE BRITISH EMPIRE

*A short history of British colonial policy, 1606-1909*. By HUGH EDWARD EGERTON. Revised by A. P. NEWTON. 9th ed. London: Methuen, 1932. 15s.

*The empire and the army*. By SIR JOHN FORTESCUE. London: Cassell, 1932. Pp. 372. 4s. 6d.

*Captain William Kidd, gentleman or buccaneer?* By CLARENCE MILLIGAN. Philadelphia: Dorrance, 1932. \$1.75.

*Louisbourg journals, 1745*. By LOUIS EFFINGHAM DE FOREST. New York: Society of Colonial Wars in the State of New York, 1932. \$2.00.

*British slave emancipation, 1838-1849*. By WILLIAM LAW MATHIESON. London: Longmans, 1932. Pp. 243. 12s. 6d.

*Conception Island, or the troubled story of the Catholic Church in Grenada, B. W. I.* Compiled chiefly from original documents and unpublished records by RAYMOND DEVAN. London: Sands, 1932. Pp. 436. 12s. 6d.

*The history of the King's School, Parramatta.* By S. M. JOHNSTONE. Foreword by the REV. A. T. P. WILLIAMS. Sydney: Council of the King's School, 1932. Pp. xviii+415.

The oldest school in Australia, founded in 1831 and opened in the following year.

*The provincial system of government in New Zealand, 1852-76.* By W. P. MORRELL. London: Longmans, 1932. 10s. 6d.

*Louis Trigardt's trek across the Drakensberg, 1837-1838.* By CLAUDE FULLER. Edited by LEO FOUCHE. London: Francis Edwards, 1932. 13s. 6d.

*The passing of the black kings.* By HUGH MARSHALL HOLE, C.M.G. London: Philip Allan, 1932. Pp. 322. 15s.

Mziligazi, Lobengula, Kharna, and Lewanika of South Africa.

*Forty years in Africa.* By TUDOR G. TREVOR. London: Hurst, 1932. Pp. 279. 12s. 6d. Important for the campaign in Southwest Africa.

*Vignettes of Indian wars.* By SIR GEORGE MACMUNN. London: Sampson Low, 1932. 12s. 6d.

*The Dalhousie-Phayre correspondence, 1852-1856.* Edited by D. G. E. HALL. Oxford: University Press, 1932. 30s.

Much new light on the second Burmese war and the years immediately following.

*The nature and evolution of the political relations between the Indian states and the British imperial government.* By PANDIT SYAMA SANKAR. Newport: Joyce & Sons, 1932. Pp. 202. 5s.

A thesis presented to the University of Geneva for the degree of Docteur ès Sciences Politiques by a former foreign minister of Jhalawar State, who sometimes makes use of confidential documents.

*Frontiers.* By SIR GEORGE DUNBAR. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1932. 16s.

The northern boundary of Assam and the no-man's land lying between that boundary and Tibet.

*Twenty years in Tibet.* By DAVID MACDONALD. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1932. Pp. 318.

The author is the son of a Scotch father and a Sikkimese mother. He accompanied the Younghusband mission to Lhasa and later became British trade agent at Yatung, in the Chumbi Valley.

*Hail, Penang!* By GEORGE BILAINKIN. London: Sampson Low, 1932. 12s. 6d.

The adventures of a newspaper editor in a community composed of Europeans, Eurasians, Malays, Chinese, Indians, and others.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

*Atlas of the historical geography of the United States.* By CHARLES O. PAULLIN. Edited by JOHN K. WRIGHT. Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington; New York: American Geographical Society, 1932. Pp. xv+162, with 166 plates. \$15.00.

This magnificent atlas, which has been twenty years in the making, is the composite work of many scholars and will fill a long-felt need. Though it covers the entire field of American history in all its aspects, attention can here be called only to the sections relating to foreign policy. The student of European history will be grateful for the reproduction of many maps of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and for maps showing Spanish and French explorations. The military operations of our wars can be readily followed, thanks to a series of conventional signs and the elimination of all unnecessary names; the Spanish-American war is illustrated by four maps; our participation in the Great War, by six. Perhaps the most useful maps are a series of eight plates dealing with the international boundaries of the United States from 1607 to 1927, for each map shows the various lines, often very numerous, involved in each negotiation; the last map of the volume indicates present and past claims. Four plates are devoted

to the foreign commerce of the United States. In every case the maps are admirably and fully explained by a text. The cartography is of a high order, and there are ample references. Heartly congratulations are in order for all concerned in the production of the book.

*General William Eaton: the failure of an idea.* By FRANCIS RENNELL RODD. New York: Minton, Balch, 1932. \$3.50.

An American patriot who played an important part in the wars against the Barbary pirates.

*Letter to General Lafayette, by James Fenimore Cooper, and related correspondence on the finance controversy.* Reproduced from the original Paris editions of 1831 and 1832 in English and in French. With a biographical note by ROBERT E. SPILLER. For the Facsimile Text Society. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 68+50.

Particularly opportune, in view of the Franco-American controversy over war debts. *John Slidell and the Confederates in Paris (1862-65).* By BECKLES WILLSON. New York: Putnam, 1932. \$3.50.

*Archibald Cary Coolidge: life and letters.* By HAROLD JEFFERSON COOLIDGE and ROBERT HOWARD LORD. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1932. \$4.50.

*The strangest friendship in history: Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House.* By GEORGE SYLVESTER VIREECK. New York: Liveright, 1932. \$3.00.

#### HISTORIANS AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

*Geschichtsphilosophie.* By DR. OTHMAR SPANN. ("Die Herdflamme. Sammlung der gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Grundwerke aller Zeiten und Völker," edited by OTHMAR SPANN, Vol. V.) Jena: Fischer, 1932. Pp. 456. Rm. 15.

*William James Ashley: a life.* By his daughter, ANNE ASHLEY. With a chapter by J. H. MUIRHEAD and an introduction by the RT. HON. STANLEY BALDWIN, M.P. London: King, 1932. Pp. 176. 8s. 6d.

One of the "fathers" of economic history, who was professor at Toronto, Harvard, and Birmingham. His *Introduction to English economic history and theory* (1888) remains a classic.

*Sismondi, 1773-1842.* By JEAN-RODOLPHE DE SALIS. Vol. I, *La vie et l'œuvre d'un cosmopolite philosophe.* Vol. II, *Lettres et documents inédits suivis d'une liste des sources et d'une bibliographie.* ("Bibliothèque de la revue de littérature comparée," Vol. LXXVII.) Berne: Francke, 1932. Pp. 481+79. Fr. 15.

*Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lorenz von Steins: ein Beitrag zur Geistesgeschichte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts.* By HEINZ NITZSCHKE. Munich: Oldenbourg, 1932. Pp. 160. Rm. 6.50.

*A bibliography of the faculty of political science of Columbia University, 1880-1930.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1931. Pp. xi+366. \$4.00.

The term "political science" must be interpreted in its broadest sense, for fully 20 per cent of the scholars included in this very full and excellent bibliography are better known as historians than as political scientists. Such men as Herbert L. Osgood, James Harvey Robinson, James T. Shotwell, and George W. Botsford are usually thought of as historians. After each name (there are sixty-three in all) are given the degrees the man has received, his various positions, a list of references to biographical material, and a chronological list of his books and articles.

The list of articles is especially valuable for locating speeches and short articles in the proceedings of associations, in bulletins of learned societies, and in periodicals which are not analyzed in the various periodical indexes.

WINIFRED VER NOOY